

Stout pamphlet collection bookplate Handwritten list of texts

The Doctrine of Evolution : A Brief Review of the Cardinal Arguments of Darwinism. By Thomson W. Leys.

"By the glare of false science betray'd, That leads to bewilder, and dazzles to blind."

—THE HERMIT.

Auckland: Printed by H. Brett, at the "Evening Star" Office, Wyndham St. 1882.

Preface.

These papers were written for a newspaper, and without any expectation that they would ever be issued in a collected form. A number of gentlemen having, however, expressed to strong desire to have them published as a pamphlet, the writer consented to that course. It became then a question whether they should be re-modelled to suit the altered shape, or allowed to go as they were. The supreme necessity for condensation in the original papers compelled the omission of many details in quotation and illustration, which might have been advantageously introduced; but it is apparent that to alter and enlarge them now would entail a radical change in the entire structure of the work, and it has been thought best to re-print the papers in the original shape, simply numbering the divisions which marked the order of their first appearance. The arguments advanced, therefore, must be regarded only as a suggestive outline, to be thought out by the reader.

A fair consideration of the obstacles to the acceptance of Darwinism will, the writer believes, confirm every dispassionate mind in the conviction that the vast chasms which are admitted by the most ardent evolutionists to be still unbridged, will for ever remain so, because the theory is in hopeless conflict with the well-established facts of Nature as they are commonly observed in the existing order of creation.

AUCKLAND,

AUGUST 18, 1882.

The Doctrine of Evolution.

I.

The lectures recently delivered by Mr. W. Denton have excited some little interest in the science of Geology, and more particularly in the associated science which is now known under the general title of Biology. We confess to a feeling of surprise that these lectures should have provoked the controversy which appears to have arisen in our Southern cities, for there was very little in the entire series, either by way of argument or illustration, that is not tolerably familiar, not merely to the scientific student, but to the reader of the ordinary magazine literature of the day; and the elementary facts which formed the staple of the geological lectures have been taught in our schools for the last twenty years. It is hardly a subject of complaint, however, that in explaining a science like geology Mr. Denton has been unable to submit much that is new to his audiences, for the details of the constant additions to our stock of knowledge of this science are of too technical and trivial a kind to interest a miscellaneous audience. And it must be said of Mr. Denton that even to scientific listeners he made ample amends for the familiarity of his materials by the freshness which he imparted in their preparation for the public. Scientific study is too little engaged in by the people for us to undervalue in any way such a course of lectures, and we heartily wish they had been better attended.

While saying so much, however, we are not to be interpreted as implying that exception might not be taken to some of the geological positions which Mr. Denton has laid down. In the face of the serious demurrers that have been entered by high authorities against the theory of a wholly fluid interior, Mr. Denton's definition of the earth's crust, as not exceeding 100 miles in thickness, was too positive. And there are even stronger objections to the stress he placed on the Whitney skull. It is worthy of remark that Professor Boyd Dawkins (whose right to speak with authority on such a subject Mr. Denton will hardly gainsay) has discussed this very question in a lecture during the current term at Owen College, Manchester. He examined the claims put forward by Professor Whitney, State geologist of California, on behalf of the Calaveras skull, and also those which have

been made with respect to the skull found in the railway cutting at Olmo and the remains found by Professor Cappellini in Italy. Having considered fairly all the circumstances connected with these discoveries, Professor Dawkins declared emphatically that "the evidence of pliocene man fell to the ground equally in Europe and in the United States."

We are not disposed to cavil at the view which an enthusiastic geological student—as Mr Denton undoubtedly is—may choose to take of questions that are still undetermined, and on which diversity of opinion is allowable, though in such cases it is desirable to avoid dogmatism. We have, however, a more serious charge to make against his exposition of the present position of the doctrine of evolution in its relation to the origin of men. Few scientific believers in the Darwinian theory have ever claimed that the theory has reached the point of absolute demonstration. One of its most uncompromising champions, writing very recently, candidly acknowledges that "there are vast chasms to be filled up) by future observation," and while speaking of the theory merely as "doing as much as any other ingenious theory has done," contends for it as only plausible escape from an admission of the miraculous. The same writer roundly abuses Professor Owen as "a trimmer," for admitting even a thought of God into the calculation, by his expressed belief in the existence of an innate "tendency" animating nature towards a certain form of future development in accordance with the predestinated purpose of the Deity. Nor does Darwin escape censure from him for a similar weakness.

"The Doctrine of Descent and Darwinism," by Oscar Schmidt, Professor in Strasburg University, 1876.

We are aware, however, that in out-running Darwin, Mr. Denton is only a participator in the craze which has infected a large proportion of the scientific world, carrying them away from the safe and truly scientific method that insists upon observation preceding theory, and launching them on a dangerous search for phenomena to support a preconceived speculation. So extra-ordinary and Wide spread has this mania become that we have recently, in this colony, seen a learned Professor of Biology, who, in all likelihood, could scarcely outline the landmarks of historical Investigation, gravely informing his class of students that Hume, Freeman, and Froude were not competent to pronounce an opinion on history as, a science "because of their being practically unacquainted with biology and the principle of selection! "

"Professor Hutton's Address on Biology," Canterbury College, March, 1882.

The vigour and dogmatism employed in the assertion of a doctrine is very often in inverse ratio to the evidence that supports it—a truth that is marvellously Illustrated in the tone of the evolutionists. We feel the greater confidence in pressing this assertion because of a conscious readiness to accept Darwinism or any other theory of the origin of life so soon it presents itself in the garb of established truth. Mere assertion and re-assertion in the absence of evidence and in defiance of phenomena everywhere around us will, however, make few converts among persons who think for themselves and have not suffered their judgment to be warped by devotion to one study to the exclusion of others of equal weight. But there is a serious danger that *ex parte* statements of the case like Mr. Denton's may mislead those who have paid little attention to the subject, and that most credulous of all classes—those possessed of "a little knowledge." And though it is beyond the Scope and compass of a newspaper article to discuss fully a question so broad in its issues as the doctrine of evolution, yet in a community without magazines, and dependent mainly upon the newspaper press for its information on these subjects, it would be a shrinking from a journalist's plain duty to avoid them.

It must occur to everyone who has familiarised himself with anthropological literature, how utterly the advocates of Darwin's theory have failed in discovering a single instance of transmutation of species. The perfect barrenness of the geological strata in such types might be inferred from the desperate persistence with which that unfortunate little four-toed animal, no larger than a fox but resembling a horse, discovered in the eocene strata of Wyoming, has been ridden to death by every essayist, lecturer, and controversialist dealing with this subject. If the Darwinian theory were true in the wide sense which is claimed for it, not only would the geological strata abound with such symbols, but in an animated nature teeming with life in every form, from the lowest to the highest types, we should discover innumerable instances of half-developed forms. What is the truth? Descending even to the very lowliest types, every animate thing is perfect, with organs marvellously adapted for its special mode of life, and producing, with a miraculous persistence, progeny identical with itself. To take a familiar illustration from Lyell: The fossil scallops of the Sicilian limestones, of which the ancient Greek temples at Girgenti (Agrigentum) were built, are identical with shell-fish inhabiting the Mediterranean; and these temples, again, stand on a hill, into the composition of which the same shells enter.

Lyell's "Manual of Elementary Geology,"

We call scarcely form a conception of the countless ages throughout which this reproduction, without variation, has gone on. To verify the Darwinian theory, however, not only must these lowly forms of life have had the power and tendency to variation, but that power has in myriads of instances been exercised steadily forward in one direction for the production of non-existent and inconceivable species—blindly evolving in their progress all the complicated mechanism of the human body, with the delicate and sensitive organs of the eye and ear. As Dr. Bakewell, in a very excellent paper on this subject, pithily says: "The age of evolutionary

miracles has ceased for the last three or four thousand years apparently. But in the earlier stages of this world's history, before things had settled down into their present quiescent state, there must have been a constant succession of miracles. There were all these special organs, such as the eye and ear, to be 'evolved,' or 'developed,' from bits of protoplasm, either by mere chance, or by wonderful self-acting laws, which were possessed of the highest and brightest intelligence; there was the utter annihilation of all the wonderful animals that must have abounded at one time or another—all the one-eyed monsters, the animals that had a cornea, and nothing more, or an optic nerve hanging out loose with no sclerotic to protect it, or little limbs, trying feebly to become legs or wings, and failing ignominiously. Nature's failures, where are they? Before one perfect pair could have been produced by evolution, there must have been millions of imperfect animals. Where are they gone? What has become of them? How is it that we only find animals perfect after their kind? How is it that the lower we go down in the scale of life, the more beautiful, the more elaborate, the more exquisitely fitting we find the organisms to be? Why will not some animals improve by a process of natural selection? Why are the crustaceans satisfied with just the same sort of eyes that they had in the earliest geological periods? I might ask dozens of such questions, to which, so far as I have read, the evolutionists have no reply."

Associated with this persistence of species is the incompetence of one species to breed successfully with another, and this objection alone was early indicated by Mr. Huxley as a fatal bar to the acceptance of Mr. Darwin's hypothesis.

Huxley's "Man's Place in Nature."

No one looking dispassionately at the experiments with domesticated animals and cultivated plants, upon which Darwin relies so largely for proof, can fail to perceive how fatally misleading these tests are. We have in New Zealand seen the variations produced in the pig by centuries of selective breeding under domestic conditions cast off in a few years of liberation in the forest, and the animal return to its primitive type. So also there may be seen, in deserted Maori cultivations, the potato ridding itself of the variations of at least three centuries of development, and returning to the wild form in which it existed in its native home in South America. The food cereals of the earth are all incapable of propagating themselves, and a generation of non-cultivation would probably see their extirpation from the globe, except in the form of their ancestral grasses. The recent Maori wheat-fields of Kawhia, which twenty years ago were laden with golden grain, are now covered with dense forest; the paper mulberry which Captain Cook saw everywhere under cultivation, is extinct. Instances innumerable might be adduced in proof that we must accept with great reservation changes under domesticity and cultivation when offered as evidence of permanent alterations in type by selective breeding under natural conditions. Variations within moderate limits, are, of course, every-day phenomena, and likewise the power of a species to adapt itself to climatic changes and altered conditions; but these qualities must not be confounded with the power of self-development and transmutation which is necessary to the demonstration of evolution as a solution of the origin of life. Daily experience tells us that where there is a marked deviation from type—for instance, a two-headed calf or four-legged chicken—the *lusus naturæ* rarely lives, to say nothing of re-producing; and when it does re-produce the general tendency of the species wipes out the irregularity.

So also in the "testimony of the rocks." It is not deniable that, in the preparation of the earth for the support of man and the higher mammalia, there is disclosed by the fossil remains of the geological strata, a succession of life that has been generally, though by no means invariably, from lower forms to higher forms, but it is scarcely pretended by anyone that there is satisfactory proof of a traceable relationship between the types that have disappeared and those that succeeded them. The exceptions to this statement are as rare as the readiness to seize and parade them is eager among the evolutionists. What standard of evolutionary perfection are we to adopt? Taking size as the measure of progressive development, the animals, reptiles, and birds now existing, are puny and degenerate representatives of those that once roamed the earth.

If the geological record and the facts of natural history had told the story of evolution, its acceptance would not have been delayed until the publication of Darwin's speculations. But the observations of the chiefs of the scientific world were almost universally against it. Early in the century Lamarck and Geoffroy St. Hilaire had hazarded the theory, in conjunction with spontaneous generation, as a plausible explanation of the origin of life; but Cuvier, the greatest naturalist the world has produced, confuted them. Lamarck, relying mainly upon the variations produced upon animals in a state of domesticity, hoped for the discovery of the remains of some of these creatures nearer the time when they were taken from their native habitats. The proof came; not merely in fossil remains, but in preserved bodies of dogs and cats found among the mummies of Egypt. Cuvier demonstrated that 2000 or 3000 years of domesticity in every variety of climate had made no perceptible change in the anatomy of these animals as we know them. The labours of Cuvier, therefore, which closed with his death in 1832, tended only to confirm the observations of his great predecessor Linnaeus, who even declared that genera like species are primordial creations.

Lyell's "Principles of Geology."

The work was taken up by Agassiz, one of the most careful observers of the century, who early declared his conviction that "the revelations of science unequivocally indicate the direct intervention of creative power,"

Agassiz and Gould's "Comparative Physiology."

and who remained an inveterate opponent of the theory of descent up to the time of his death in 1873. Coming to the observers in the department of geology, we pass over Hugh Miller's defence of the Mosaic account of the creation, only to find Sir Charles Lyell, so late as 1855, with the whole geological record laid bare before him, writing vigorously against the doctrine of transmutation of species. It is true that since the publication of the "Origin of Species," in 1858, he has embodied in his "Principles of Geology" and "Geological Evidences of the Antiquity of Man," Mr Darwin's theory as a suggestive and plausible one; but the evidences of transmutation of species have remained in every material respect just as they were before Darwin's book appeared, despite the advent of the little Orohippus and the so-called lizard-tailed bird, over which the Darwinians have shed tears of rapture. It is a sufficient indication of the general tenor of the teachings of geology, that a most industrious personal search among the rocks, extending over thirty years, during which he had completely systematized the whole science of geology, left Sir Charles Lyell an active opponent of the doctrine of transmutation of species. Truly, if, as Mr Denton averred, it be a token of ignorance to express a doubt about the doctrine of descent we have the consolation of being in good company even among the Darwinians, to say nothing of the vast number of thinkers, scientific and philosophical, who still defend the theory of special creations, not excepting that American scientist who, in a certificate to Mr Denton's status, made a special reservation against committing himself to that gentlemen's views on this subject.

II.

The Antiquity of Man.

As it is probable that a large number of persons under whose notice this paper may come are unfamiliar with geological terms, it will assist them in understanding our remarks on the antiquity of man if we explain, first of all, that the word pliocene is the name applied to the last completed strata of the earth. It is the newest division of the tertiary formation. Overlying the pliocene in places are alluvial and other deposits such as are now in constant process of formation by the action of rivers, lakes, mountain drifts, and various familiar causes. The pliocene formation abounds with the remains of animals now on the earth, every species of which is represented in its fossil bones—man alone is absent. It is well to bear this fundamental fact in mind, because not only does it prove that, according to our present ascertained knowledge, drawn from purely scientific data, man is a recent tenant of the earth, but it also shows that his advent was subsequent to the creation of that animal kingdom over which he now holds undivided sway. The obvious bearing of this question upon Biblical chronology, as well as on the evolution theory, gave a special impulse to the search for human remains, and in no department of geological inquiry has more activity been exhibited. Hitherto, these researches have resulted in an agreement amounting practically to unanimity among all classes of investigators, that no trace of man has yet been discovered in the pliocene formation. Alleged discoveries impugning this position have occasionally been put forward, but the application of scientific tests has quickly dissipated the assumption and confirmed the former observations. We take the recent declaration of Professor Boyd Dawkins in the lectures at Owen's College, Manchester, as conclusive proof that the question remains unaltered by any recent discovery. Professor Dawkins has, for many years, been the most ardent and successful British worker in this special department of science; he is also a member of the committee appointed by the British Association to conduct the excavations in Kent's Cave. To a wide experience he adds great scientific attainments and a broad judgment. We are justified, therefore, in accepting his opinion as authoritative, confirming as it does the previous observations of Lyell, and other eminent geologists. Here, then, we find a secure starting point.

Cave-Hunting.

Among the deposits of the recent or human period; those in caves have been the richest in relics of man. Cave-hunting has become almost a special branch of geological research, and the literature relating to it is interesting and voluminous. The limits of a paper like this, however, confine us to a statement of the general conclusions. In the Brixham caverns flint weapons were distributed through a bed of gravel twenty feet thick intermingled with the remains of the extinct mammoth, rhinoceros, and cave bear. In Kent's Cave, which has been systematically prospected by a committee of eminent geologists appointed by the British Association the discoveries were of a similar character, the bones of an extinct hyena being among the most numerous of the remains. Bone and flint weapons were found intermingled with the ancient fossils. In the Brunquiel cave, France; in the lower gravels of Abbeville; and in various other places, human bones or flint implements have

been found mixed indiscriminately with the bones of extinct mammals.

Difficulties in Determining Age.

Many and widely different guesses have been hazarded respecting the age of these remains, but a moment's reflection will show how impossible it is to get any certain data upon which to proceed. Some of the caves have been used as burying places, and holes may have been dug to receive the bones. In others the bones may have sunk into soft mud, or been disturbed by water. In order to determine, even approximately, the time occupied in the formation of a particular deposit, we must assume that the same causes now in operation have always been operating. But this, we know, is most improbable. In no country more than New Zealand are there better proofs of the unreliability of conclusions drawn from such premises. Being in transition from a state of nature to a state of cultivation, the country is a favourable one for observation—the changes are rapid and well marked. Consider for example, the gravel deposits of the Wairarapa plain and Hutt valley. There, broad rivers, carrying down enormous quantities of stones and gravel, have shifted their beds frequently within a very few years. A farmer has looked out of his window in the morning after a heavy flood and beheld to his dismay that where his cattle were depastured the day before a river was flowing, while his neighbour discovered, with equal astonishment, nothing but a broad stony track where he had long been wont to fish. Art is now doing what nature might ultimately have accomplished, by strengthening with protective works the points where these rivers are liable to break away. The destruction of the heavy forest on the surrounding hills will diminish the volume of water. And we may easily picture a learned savant of Masterton city, two centuries hence—finding these deep and widely-spread gravel deposits miles away from a little brook flowing through smiling fields in its well-formed bed—propounding learned theories about the causes of the boulder formation upon the Wairarapa plains, and proving by abstruse calculations that the Maori bones discovered in the lower gravels date back at the very least to the glacial period.

In other parts of New Zealand, rivers that were navigable have completely silted up in the course of a few years. At the entrance to the Waimea river (near Nelson) the depth of water has been decreased within ten years, by deposits of mud, from 14 feet to 5 feet. The Government are at this moment erecting a retaining wall at Collingwood with a view of restoring the Aore River to its proper channel. The denudation of the forest-clad hills has materially affected the volume and the rapidity of our rivers, and the amount of debris brought down. In our harbours similar phenomena are everywhere observable. Banks of sand forming at one point have given a new direction to tidal currents, producing extensive and rapid alterations. Landslips have prepared new stumbling-blocks for unborn Lyells and Darwins. At Taupo, within the last twenty years, the chief Te Heuheu and his entire settlement were engulfed by an enormous landslip. We can well imagine that some enterprising settler a century hence, sinking a well on the spot, may cast out the buried warrior's skull from the bottom of his shaft, and another Whitney arising shall prove conclusively to his own satisfaction that instead of coming here about the 14th century, as declared in their traditions and genealogies, the Maoris have occupied these islands at least five thousand years. Disturbances like these, climatic changes, and a multitude of other forces have been at work with tenfold greater power in Europe than in New Zealand, even within the historical period, and they constitute an ever-varying quantity which it is utterly impossible to compute.

When it is said that human remains have been found intermingled with those of the last representatives of the mammoth and other extinct mammalian monsters, the mind is carried back to some very remote period. But the deposits in which these remains are found prove that the animals survived till a comparatively recent time, and man unquestionably assisted in their final extermination. One contemporary of the mammoth—our friend the moa—has not long disappeared from the earth, and some people are sanguine enough to believe that the mountain fastnesses of Otago will yet yield us a living bird to keep company with the three surviving specimens of his old companion the giant notornis, the last of which was killed near Lake Te Anau, Otago, three years ago. The causes that produce the extinction of certain species are still a matter of the vaguest speculation; Cuvier attributed the sudden disappearance of extensive forms of life—and no doubt rightly—to violent changes in the condition of the earth. We know that certain races of men are rapidly disappearing. The whole of the ancient inhabitants of Polynesia, including the Maoris, are dying out with extraordinary rapidity. "The black man always gives way before the white man," is a commonly offered but exceedingly indefinite explanation of the phenomenon. And the answer fails to meet the case, because, as Mr A. R. Wallace proved by the rapid decrease of the Dyaks—and the same facts have been observed in many parts of Polynesia—once densely populated places, where white men have never intruded, give the same evidence of decay that we see in the rest of the Polynesian people. Nor in New Zealand does the presence of the white man account for that extraordinary sterility which is one of the most striking causes of Maori depopulation. Mr. Fenton, Chief Judge of the Native Lands Court in statistics relating to certain Waikato tribes, shewed that there were 650 deaths to 320 births; while out of 433 marriages, 154 had been without issue; and 68 were without children through

death, leaving only 221 with living issue. A multitude of phenomena lead to the inference that races, like individuals, reach a stage in their history when they become incapable of reproduction and then they decrease and finally disappear by a process of natural decay. A very valuable paper on this subject by A. K. Newman, M.B., M.R.C.P., is published in the "Transactions of the New Zealand Institute" for 1881.

Besides the depth of alluvial deposits, other tests have been applied to determine man's antiquity. Agassiz found a human bone in the coral beds of Florida, which he believed must from its position have been lying there ten thousand years. But here again the same difficulty confronts us. Can we be sure that the formation of the coral has gone on with unvarying regularity for 10,000 years. The balance of probabilities turns the other way. All that can be affirmed on this question of antiquity, as Professor Dawkins justly observes, is this—that recent discoveries appear to favour the belief in a higher antiquity for man than was at first supposed.

"Cave Hunting," by Professor W. Boyd Dawkins.

Exploded Ideas about Savage Races.

Nothing makes us more distrustful of conclusions drawn from uncertain premises than the blunders which scientific men of high position have made in matters that are ascertainable. What could be further from the truth than the opinions that have been almost universally held concerning the intelligence of barbarous races. Consider the case of the Maori. Less than a century ago the aborigines of these islands were regarded as among the most barbarous and intractable of savages. Their cannibal orgies, their primitive stone implements and weapons, their perpetual wars, were cited as indicating a thoroughly vicious people. Close acquaintance, however, has utterly dispelled the illusion. We have found the Maori fully equalling the illiterate Caucasian in intelligence; brave and hospitable, possessing a remarkable poetry and mythology, a strong realistic belief in immortality, and preserving genealogical and historical records, the accuracy of which has been established by searching examinations in the Native Land Courts. Their representatives—of pure blood—take an active part in the Parliament of the country, speaking intelligently, not only upon native questions, but on general subjects. And (Colonel Trimble) who is not remarkable for philo-Maori proclivities, speaking in the House of Representatives of one of these so-called savages, declared his opinions in these words (*vide* Hansard reports): "I agree with everything that has been said in regard to the moral and intellectual qualities of To Whiti. . . . I have not the slightest doubt that Te Whiti is as good as any man in this House; and in intellectual qualifications I believe that he exceeds a very large proportion of the gentlemen of this House." We cannot, in view of statements like these made in the Parliament of the colony, and receiving confirmation from our everyday experience, fail to admit that the savage who alarmed our infantile imagination is largely, if not altogether, as pure a myth as those other bogies that caused the youthful horror-monger to draw his head shudderingly under the bed-clothes. Who does not remember those terrible coloured plates depicting Captain Cook clubbed by a band of monsters. Yet we know that those very people were the mild Sandwich Islanders, who, in the first instance reverencing their pale-faced visitors as superior beings, soon discovered from the licentious behaviour of the crew that they were very ordinary mortals indeed; and roused at last to indignation by the ruthless desecration of their sacred places, mustered courage enough to revenge their wrongs. If there remained any lingering belief in the faithfulness of that picture, the appearance of King Kalakau as an honoured guest of the English Court and American President must ere this have dispelled it. Moreover, a civilisation which has not yet discarded war as the arbiter in international disputes cannot afford to say much about that recklessness of human life which is the worst feature of pure barbarism.

The Maori Cosmogony.

We do not wish to extend a paper which has already passed its intended limits, by multiplying instances of misapprehensions by men who write with confidence and authority. But one blunder committed by Sir John Lubbock, who would be quoted as an authority by any author, tells the story of many a learned theory built upon the unsound footing of defective knowledge. In that celebrated and oft quoted work, "The Origin of Civilisation," he tells his readers that the New Zealander had no idea of a creation.

"Origin of Civilisation," Sir John Lubbock.

Let us examine this statement by the light of the interesting little work on "Maori Religion and Mythology," lately published by Dr Shortland. We therein find that though the Maoris had no clear tradition of a creation, they did possess a well-defined and exceedingly curious cosmogony; "The great mysterious cause of all things existing in the Cosmos was, as the Maori conceived it, the Generative Power. Commencing with a primitive state of Darkness, he conceived Po (Night) as a person capable of begetting a race of beings resembling itself. After a succession of several generations the race of Po Te Ata (Morn) was given birth to. Then followed certain beings existing when Cosmos was without form and void. Afterwards come Rangi (Heaven), Papa

(Earth) the winds and other sky powers, as are recorded in the genealogical traditions preserved to the present time." "The first woman in the Maori mythology drags down her offspring to Po (Night), meaning death." Dr. Shortland is struck with the many points of similarity between the Greek and Maori mythologies.

"Maori Religion and Mythology," by Shortland, M.A., M.R.C.P., late Native Secretary, New Zealand.

Edison on Scientific Frauds.

Though in some degree wandering from the subject, we have been led to these remarks with a view of shewing by familiar illustrations how unreliable many of the conceptions from which we are accustomed to draw momentous deductions are, even when relating to matters where error is almost inexcusable. Edison, the great American electrician, asserted in a letter to the "New York Herald," on December 31st, 1879, that "They (scientific text books) are most misleading. I get mad with myself when I think I have believed what was so learnedly set out in them. There are more frauds in science than anywhere else. I have been thrown off my track often by them, and for months at a time. You see a great name and you believe it. Try the experiment yourself and you find the result altogether different." If in spheres of observation where it is possible to be exact, the way is strewn with errors dressed in the learned garb of science, we must walk still more cautiously when purely speculative theories are offered for our acceptance.

Ancient Skulls Refute the Doctrine of Descent.

Coming back, however, more immediately to the subject—we would observe that the question of man's antiquity has only one bearing upon the doctrine of evolution, and by general confession of the Darwinians that has so far gone against them. It is of no great importance whether man has been 6,000 or 20,000 years on the earth; it is, however, of importance to know whether the earliest human skulls bring us any nearer to a brute type; and scientific accuracy compels even ardent believers in Darwinism to confess that they do not. The two most celebrated skulls are the English skull found in a Belgium cave, with the remains of the mammoth, and the Neanderthal cranium. Mr. Huxley has carefully recorded his observations on these discoveries, and it is sufficient to give his conclusions. Of the English skull he says:—"It is, in fact, a fair average human skull, which might have belonged to a philosopher, or might have contained the thoughtless brains of a savage." Of the Neanderthal remains, though of lower type, he says with equal emphasis:—"In no sense can the Neanderthal bones be regarded as the remains of a human being intermediate between men and apes." Summing up his observations on the most ancient human remains yet discovered, Professor Boyd Dawkins says: "There is no evidence that the palæolithic people were inferior in intellectual capacity to many of the lower races of the present time, or more closely linked to the lower animals. The traces which they have left behind tell us nothing as to the truth or falsehood of the doctrine of evolution."

"Cave Hunting," by Professor W. Boyd Dawkins.

Professor Owen adds his testimony that the several human skulls that have been found show no characters whatever indicative of an inferior or transitional type; while ultra-Darwinists, like Oscar Schmidt, candidly admit that there is no more possibility of the hard, bony, ox-like skull and powerful brute jaws of any species of existing ape, being transformed into the human head than the human head could be transformed into that of a monkey.

"The Doctrine of Descent and Darwinism," by Professor Schmidt, Strasburg University.

What refuge, then, is found in this unfortunate dilemma? The evolutionists offer a twofold reply. First of all they tell us that though the caves of Europe and America have been ransacked in vain for the "missing link," there are still those of Asia and Africa—the cradle of the human race—left to them. And next they answer that it is not incumbent upon them to produce transitional forms, that inasmuch as their theory has, in their opinion, more inherent probability than the theory of special creation, they are warranted in believing it. Very true; there is no limit to a man's rights of belief, but pray do not let us have private beliefs and opinions thrust upon us in the name of science. If the doctrine of Descent is true, we know there must have been transitional forms; and not only have those forms never been found, but the earliest human remains directly controvert their existence by extorting from the apostles of Darwinism an admission that the size and form of skull exhibits no trace of transition or evolution during a period which, according to Darwinian calculations, extends ages beyond the theological limit, six thousand years.

III.

Man's Physical Frame.

THAT there are many broad general resemblances between man and the lower animals was not left for science to discover. The most primitive savage must have observed that the ordinary functions of life are discharged by organs and processes common to men and brutes. They both see with eyes, hear with ears, and smell through nostrils; each has a heart, lungs, nerves, blood, and assimilates food by a process that is common to all. It is a curious thing that these obvious and striking points of resemblance, which appear on the surface, and may be easily apprehended by a mind incapable of following abstruse anatomical investigations, are rarely alluded to by the Darwinians in urging their cause. Instead, we hear much about bones and skulls and ovules, and mysterious integrations and differentiations, to the narration of which the quidnunc listens with gaping mouth, while the innocent doubter hides his abashed head. Yet as a strict matter of fact no resemblance that has ever been discovered under the anatomist's knife is half so striking as those we have enumerated, and which men's minds, from all time, have regarded with equanimity. Why is it, then, that so little stress is placed upon them by the expounders of the doctrine of descent? Well, partly, perhaps, because the man of science is nothing if not very learned, and it is more impressive to speak of the proportions of a lumbar vertebrae, or the shape and quality of a vitelline membrane, than to discourse upon the astounding instinct which teaches a dog to relish a mutton chop for breakfast, a peculiarity marvellously developed in man; though in both instances, the savoury morsel passes down a gullet, finds assimilation through digestive organs, and builds up the bones, the flesh, and the tissues with the aid of a heart, lungs, and blood-vessels. Yet who is so thoroughly proof against the fascinations of scientific jargon as not to be more deeply impressed with the identity of a vitelline membrane than with a common penchant for mutton chops? The secret of our amenability to an argument resting on allusions of mysterious significance lies, however, somewhat deeper than the respect we pay to long words. When a man is told that he is a near relative to the dog because he eats, and sees, and hears, as a dog does, he perceives at once the absurdity of the proposition, because while he recognises and acknowledges the resemblance, he also sees and feels the overwhelming differences which dwarf the similarities into insignificance. He feels the possession of immeasurably higher faculties and powers, of nobler capacities, of a spirit that can rule the world, grasp the secrets of the infinite universe, and hold intercourse with the great Father of Spirits, from whom it has drawn its life and inspiration. But what can a man answer when he is confronted with a lumbar vertebrae and a vitelline membrane? What, indeed, but sigh and exclaim, "Then all is lost."

It may perhaps afford some relief, however, to an unfortunate truth-seeker in this undone condition to know that if in the living man there are distinguishing marks which those who run may read, his skeleton, whatever the general resemblances, possesses characteristics that are unmistakable. Huxley, an apostle of evolution, admits that—"The structural differences between man and even the highest apes are great and significant; every bone of a gorilla bears marks by which it might be distinguished from the corresponding bone of a man; and in the present creation, at any rate, no intermediate link bridges over the gap between homo and troglodytes."

Huxley's "Man's Place in Nature."

The hard, bony, sloping skull of the monkey, and small brain capacity, its protruding jaws and powerful fangs fitted for fighting its shaggy hide, dissipate the impression, which the grotesque burlesque of a man's face is liable to create. The largest brain capacity exhibited in a full grown gorilla is only 34½ cubic inches; the smallest cranium observed in any race of men, 63 cubic inches.

Huxley's "Man's Place in Nature."

"Another striking difference between monkeys and men is that the former never walk with ease in an erect posture, but always use their arms in climbing or in walking on all-fours like most quadrupeds. The monkeys we see in the street dressed up and walking erect only do so after much drilling and teaching just as dogs may be taught to walk in the same way; and the posture is almost as unnatural to the one animal as to the other."

A. R. Wallace in the Contemporary for March.

Von Baer, one of most eminent physiologists of the century, proved that the feet of the monkey—which are really hands—form an impassable barrier between the man and the ape. It is scarcely worth while to dwell further upon this part of the subject, since the idea that any known ape could advance to the capacity of man, in any conceivable number of ages, has long ago been abandoned by all classes of Darwinists. The only thing contended for now is that the resemblances signify a common origin, a position which once more lands us in questions of mere unsupported speculation and opinion, and science forsakes its true sphere.

Embryonic Types.

Given a pre-conceived idea, and how readily the mind discovers confirmation of it in a thousand trivial circumstances. The criminal detects the reflection of his guilt in every human eye; the jealous Moor found fatal confirmation of his mistress's faithlessness in the generous impulses of a good heart; and who shall say how many innocent men have forfeited life and freedom through a damning chain of false suggestions. Even the

gambler never fails to find a connected system in the uncertain round of chances that are luring him onward to destruction. But no gambler ever clung to straws so frail as those which have been gravely contended for as great planks in the Evolution platform. The argument based on what is termed Embryology is one of the most ridiculous of these. Darwin and Huxley were content to indicate the broad fact that the human ovum is no larger than that of a dog, about 1-125th of an inch in diameter; that in the early stages of development it is impossible, among the vertebrate animals, to distinguish one from the other, all being developed in the same way; and that the more closely animals resemble one another in adult structure, the longer and more intimately do their embryos retain a general identity in appearance. Hækel, however, whose theories—plastidule souls, et hoc genus omne—distinguish him as a man who will not stick at trifles, went a stage further. He devised the four plates exhibited by Mr. Denton in illustrating his lectures, representing various stages in the embryonic development of a man, a dog, a chicken, and a tortoise. Then pointing to six fissures which mark the embryo mammal at a very rudimentary period, he exclaims: "Ah, don't you see how like gills these are—old mother cod has left her mark." Pointing to the rudimentary development of the spinal column not yet filled out, new ecstasies seize the agitated professor, and he gasps: "See now, we've got the tail; you may drop it hereafter, but there's no getting away from it here." But as one sceptical writer has pointed out, a close examination of Hækel's plates makes it evident, from the abnormal size of the head in the embryo tortoise, that the tortoise must have descended from the man, and not man from the tortoise, while the fish-gills have got into the wrong place, being right across the front of the thorax instead of at the side, where as is shown by Hækel's own drawings of the embryonic fish, the true gills are actually developed. The upper fissures or folds on the embryo of the mammal, turn out upon Hækel's confession to be the rudimentary jaws: "The first pair of gill-arches differentiate into the rudiments of the upper and lower jaws." Carl Ernest Von Baer, who was described by Hækel himself as "our greatest naturalist," and "a gifted and profound thinker and biologist," until he vigorously assailed Evolution, when Hækel lost faith in him, cleverly satirised the attempt to force man in his embryonic state through the series of lower animals. He demonstrated that the germinal fissures, in the embryo, are appropriate to the vessels afterwards revealed, and that in the whole process of development there is nothing distantly suggestive of change from one type to another. That von Baer is a man who speaks of what he knows in this particular department of scientific research will be admitted when it is mentioned that Huxley places his name first among the scientific investigators who reduced to system the principles of embryonic development.

Assuming, however, for one moment, that these fissures do bear some resemblance to gill arches, and are on the side instead of on the front of the throat, and are not rudimentary jaws, what a daring flight of the imagination would be requisite to establish them as ancestral marks. Darwin tells us that "after twelve generations the proportion of blood, to use a common expression, from an ancestor is only 1 in 1 2048." Starting with these figures, Mr. A. W. Hall, an American writer, has calculated that at the 100th generation the proportion of ancestral influence would be

One in 1,116,700,203,157,979,981,456,633,757,926.

And to reach the nearest fish a hundred miles of figures would hardly measure the fraction. As the Darwinian theory admits in the law of heredity only a blood transmission, what potent power that ancestral fish must have had to have so impressed all its succeeding progeny countless ages after the use for gills had disappeared. But even Darwin's minute measure of ancestral influence is reduced from an expressible quantity to an absolute myth within the first two or three generations by that constant process of waste which brings about a complete change in the component parts of every body within the life of a single individual. Huxley says: "So constant and universal is this absorption, waste, and reproduction, that it may be said with perfect certainty that there is left in no one of our bodies at the present moment a millionth part of the matter of which they were originally formed."

Lectures on "The Origin of Species."

Yet H[unclear: ac]kel assures us, with respect to this childish attempt at resemblance, "I see one of the most important and irrefutable proofs of the theory of descent."

"History of Creation," vol. 1.

Von Baer depicts the bird as retaliating the argument of descent upon man by shewing that, in the embryonic state, the human embryo has the same kind of airless bones, the same rudimentary head, the same thin feathershafts, but that man never advances to that highly organised state which would fit him for flight, nor develops on his skin a warm coat of feathers, or, as an attachment to his skull, so useful an appendage as a beak. All that can be affirmed scientifically is what Huxley has advanced, that the ovules of every species of mammalia so closely resemble each other as to elude microscopic observation. But Tyndall very justly observed in his address as President of the British Association in 1870, that the microscope is useless, and may be positively mischievous when employed in determining the essential qualities of germ structure, which it is as incapable of discriminating as the changes of crystallization or the qualities of a diamond. We know, absolutely, from the results, that whatever the relative proportion of size and microscopic appearance, every

ovum must be as essentially different in its nature and qualities from every other germ, as the fully developed products are different from each other. Darwinism, to teach any lesson of evolution from the identity of ovules, should be able to show that the ovum of a dog will equally well produce a wolf, a lion, or a monkey. Nay, accidents of this kind ought to be of common occurrence, and the failure of species to propagate with each other is due to a strange and unaccountable perversity. While such obstinacy exists as an aggressive fact however, similarities in appearance of the ovules teach us how utterly baffled all science stands in presence of this simple phenomenon of the development of varying life performed right under the microscope. No intelligible suggestion has ever been hazarded in elucidation of the action of the vital forces in the germ, and yet, beaten away discomfited from the simpler inquiry, the learned theorist approaches with unbounded confidence that immeasurably vaster problem, the sources of that infinite variety of life with which the whole earth teems.

Reversion.

The evidence from Reversion advanced by Darwin may be conveniently classed with that of Embryology; it is worth no more, and descends to equal, if not greater, absurdities. Reversions are supposed to consist of human malformations which make any near approach to an animal type, such as the misplacement of mammæ. Darwin, in his "Origin of Species," calmly advanced a case of this kind as "revealing the descent of man from some lower form in an unmistakable manner." He was not unconscious, however, of the strain placed upon human credulity by the proposition, for in another paragraph he remarks: "No doubt it is a very surprising fact that characters should re-appear after having been lost for many, probably *hundreds of generations*." Very surprising truly—so surprising that no one who works out the proposition by the light of that 100 miles of figures will hesitate long in determining the value of this evidence of a brute ancestry. Why a suggestion so monstrous should ever have been propounded is the more curious that any sensible old nurse might have supplied a better explanation. It is curious, however, to note how desperate the pursuit after such links has been, and into what a maze of contradictions and absurdities it has landed the sage professors. In Siamese twins Darwin would see nothing but a monstrosity; in a child born lame or blind, or with four fingers instead of five, only a deformity; an unusually well developed child would be a favourable variation by natural selection. But misplaced mammæ would be a reversion inherited probably from some animal that lived millions of years ago, whose fossil bones lie deep down in the womb of the earth. And this is what science has come to in the nineteenth century, under the guidance of evolutionary ethics!

If there is any principle at all about the law of Natural Selection, and the phenomena of Reversals, how comes it that in circumstances where a reversal to a former type is tempted by peculiarly favourable conditions, it invariably refuses to come. How gladly would the frozen Eskimo welcome the warm coat of his counterfeit ancestor; but his skin, as proved by scientific examination, is essentially the same as that of a man inhabiting the burning tropic zone. Archdeacon Maunsell, in an admirable pamphlet published several years ago, mentions that at Isabel Island, Melanesia, there are a people who have built their houses in trees 80 or 90 feet high; born and bred in trees, ascending them by bamboo ladders and running along the branches in a perfectly erect posture with the acrobatic skill that comes of long practice. Yet they have made no progress towards a development of prehensile power in the foot, nor do they exhibit a single reversionary step in the direction of the ape. Everywhere around we have evidence of the rapid return of the cultivated plant to its original form; of the readiness with which the varieties produced in domestic animals by variation are thrown aside. Can we doubt that if there were any reversionary tendencies in man towards a brute type the crucial tests applied to him in his wide distribution over the earth, under every variety of climate, and exposed to the worst struggle for existence, would develop them somewhere? If, therefore, the structural unity of man in every essential respect throughout the globe fails to convince any investigator that whatever our ancestry may have been, the final transmutation dates to a period too long ago for the perpetuation by heredity of ancestral traces in embryonic types and reversion, he has reached that mental state when reason is made impregnable by an armour of prejudice. We only ask that when instances of the kind in living species are presented for an investigator's judgment he will rid his mind of absurdly laboured theories, and apply to them those rules of common sense which are his ordinary guide in daily life.

IV.

Rudimentary Organs.

IN an article upon Evolution, contributed to the ninth edition of the Encyclop[*unclear*: re]dia Britannica, Mr. Huxley says:—"It is almost impossible to prove that any structure, however rudimentary, is useless—that is to say, that it plays no part whatever in the economy; and if it is in the slightest degree useful, there is no reason

why, on the hypothesis of direct creation, it should not have been created. Nevertheless, double-edged as is the argument from rudimentary organs, there is none which has produced a greater effect in promoting the general acceptance of the theory of Evolution." No one who has read much of the literature of Evolution can doubt the force, at any rate, of the latter part of this passage; An article upon Evolution in the *Fortnightly* for December, signed G. J. Romanes, F.G.S., is a fair sample of the style of reasoning from such premises. The writer, in extravagant phraseology, literally casts all lingering doubts away before the shrine of the whale and the python (most suggestive combination). And as these creatures are relied upon by all Darwinians, as the best proofs from morphology, let us consider them. The whale suckles its young, and having, on that account, been rightly classed with mammalia by naturalists, it obviously became a tempting subject for the evolutionists, "See," said they, "the whale looks so like a fish that it was for a long time classed as one, yet it is a true animal, and has only become habituated to aquatic habits by modification." Hækel expresses the views of Darwin on this subject fully when he says:—"Some serpents, viz., the giant serpents (boa-python) have still in the hinder portion of the body some useless little bones which are the remains of lost hind-legs. In like manner, mammals of the whale tribe (cetacea) which have only fore-legs fully developed (breast-fins) have further back in their body another pair of undeveloped hind-legs. The same thing occurs in many genuine fishes, in which the hind-legs have in like manner been lost." . . . "It is probable that the remarkable legion of whales (cetacea) originated out of hoofed animals, which accustomed themselves to aquatic life, and thereby became transformed into the shape of a fish."

This proposition, it will be observed, involves a sort of evolution backwards. That Natural Selection should have taken all the pains to bring the progenitors of the Whales forward to the dignity of hoofed animals, and then, finding somehow that a mistake had been made, worked them back into fishes, is no less extraordinary than that, having succeeded in ridding the subject of its useless hind-legs, it failed in rooting out the rudiments. The whole theory, however, on its very threshold prompts a somewhat pertinent inquiry. If all the mammalia sprang from fishes, as evolutionists assert, why should it be necessary to pre-suppose that the whale has passed through the intermediary existence of a land animal? The difficulty of accounting for the origin of the uninherited instinct by which the first mammal learned to suckle, when all its ancestors had been cold-blooded and oviparous, may just as well be faced at one place as the other. But it is these awkward questions which the Darwinians conveniently keep in the background. A few minutes' reflection upon the method by which the true fish propagates its species and the practice among birds and mammals will suffice to convey to the mind of the reader an idea of the nut which remains to be cracked at the point of transmutation from one state to the other under a system dependent entirely upon inherited instinct. It is scarcely less awkward than the earlier unexplained problem of a self-propagating life developing into that dual propagation by impregnation which we see around us as a law that is universal except in the very lowest organisms. We need do no more than indicate these objections, which are only two out of the numberless barriers obstructing the path of the evolutionist at every stage of his progress. They are important enough, however, to receive more consideration from the reader than it is desirable to give in this paper.

Returning to the whale, in whose history Evolution has played such high fantastic tricks, it is necessary to explain that, besides the bones which are claimed as rudimentary legs, there are in the embryo of some species of whale seventy teeth on each side of the jaw, which never cut the gum, their purpose being superseded by the growth of baleen (whalebone). Now, the theory advanced by the evolutionist runs something like this:—That a hoofed animal having, through the operation of causes unknown, taken permanently to the water, with a gullet of not more than an inch and a-half in diameter, it had some trouble in getting a living. Hence, it sustained itself upon marine mollusca, and Nature obligingly extended its mouth to a length of sixteen feet, and provided it with two tons of baleen as a strainer, to meet the requirements of its altered conditions of life—the teeth, being no longer required, became rudimentary. But here another obstacle arises—all the whales have not been treated alike. The Sperm Whale, which to a diet of fish adds large quantities of cephalopod mollusks, has no whalebone whatever in its mouth, and it develops a set of terrible teeth, about forty-eight on the lower jaw, and knows how to use them. Instead of teeth on the upper jaw, however, there is a groove into which the lower teeth fit. Now it is certain that the growth of baleen has not deprived this whale of its upper teeth, and it has to strain its food under difficulties, for to a mouth that is twenty or thirty feet long it adds a gullet of ample capacity for the admission of any man not addicted to corpulence. The Rorqual, again—the largest of the whale family—possesses whalebone, and, like the Greenland whale, is devoid of teeth, but it consumes fish with great avidity. Upon opening one of these monsters, between five and six hundred large rock-cod have been found, besides a vast amount of smaller fry. In the Rorqual, therefore, Natural Selection has done a most improper and inconvenient thing, by aborting its teeth, and thereby dooming the wretched animal to consume codfish without any power of mastication.

The treatment of whales with regard to the dorsal fin has likewise followed no fixed rule. The Cacholot (*Physeter Tursio*), which has teeth and no whalebone, possesses a very high dorsal fin; the Rorqual has a fin

and whalebone; the Humpback, which also has whalebone instead of teeth, possesses a rudimentary dorsal fin in the shape of a hump on its back. The Greenland whale is without dorsal fin. Now, if rudimentary legs betoken descent from a hoofed animal, does a Rudimentary dorsal fin indicate that the Humpback has come up in the opposite direction from a fish, and where have the other two species got their fins from—the hoofed animal or the earlier ancestor?

The rudimentary legs, for which Evolution is supposed to supply an explanation, beautiful in its simplicity, land us in a Similar quandary. The whale is not the only representative of aquatic mammalia. The porpoise, the dolphin, the grampus, the manatus, and the dugong, all come into the same class. The dugong is the most remarkable of all the fish mammals; it is herbivorous, and holds its young above water with one flipper when suckling while swimming with the other. But Darwin admits, and speaks of it as a "remarkable peculiarity," that in none of these animals is there even a rudiment of a hind limb. Yet Hæckel assures us that "many genuine fishes" have the rudimentary limbs, though they are absent from these fish-mammals. In like manner the boa constrictor is the only one of all the snake tribe in which the so called "useless little bones" dignified as rudimentary legs, appear, and in it there are no rudimentary fore-legs. It is not, so far as we can discover, contended that the boa belongs to an order of reptiles different in its origin from all the rest of the snake tribe, therefore these "useless little bones" must do duty for the entire family, and serve besides as main pillars in the Darwinian system.

The subject of rudimentary organs is too intricate and technical to discuss in an article like this, at the length that would be requisite to throw light on their occurrence. That in the majority of instances, if not invariably, they serve some purpose in the economy of the animal is, however, infinitely more reasonable than that an animal should continue to propagate rudimentary structures ages after the organs themselves had been discarded, and the animal has lost any conception of their use.

It has been very cleverly argued by Mr. A. W. Hall that such structures are often attributable to the mental impressions of the mother in successive generations, produced by surroundings of advanced animal life, in which well-developed organs are the all prevalent rule. This explanation applied to the Greenland whale, which, through want of teeth, has been rendered almost helpless against the fierce attacks of the grampus, is a simple and much more credible one than the theory that these rudiments are the pointers to aborted teeth inherited from a hoofed ancestor. There are of fair grounds for believing, however, that the embryonic teeth are of essential service to the young whale. The baleen hangs only from the roof of the mouth; it is of slow growth, and is valueless to the suckling calf, while the hardness imparted to the lower jaw by the dental pulp may be of essential service. The freak of a hoofed animal, aided by chance variations, is at best a poor explanation of the presence of a creature so well-equipped as a whale is for its work in seas where the water obtains a specific colouring from the myriads of mollusca that inhabit it. To any minor variation within particular species or families little exception would be taken, because no one has ever seriously disputed the existence of extensive capabilities of adaptation to special modes of life. But anything like actual transmutation is, we contend, opposed to the entire teaching of zoology.

The treatment of rudimentary organs by the Darwinians is characterised by that straining for evidence to support a preconceived theory, which was commented upon in our remarks upon Embryology. If an organ cannot be well accounted for, it is useless; if however, it approaches a shape that can, by any process, be twisted into evidence for transmutation, it becomes rudimentary and a "pointer". What are rudimentary and useless organs? That arrangement of muscles which makes every inch of a man's external body movable, and more or less under control, may be objected to as largely superfluous wherever it is not either essential to existence or useful in the struggle for life. In his lecture on the "Origin of Man," Mr. Denton took an objection of this kind when citing as "a pointer" to an ancestral ape the power men have of moving the scalp and ears. If, however, before advancing this unique proposition he had put it to the test by simply placing his hand at the back of his own skull when indulging in that little art of arching the eyebrows which is employed with such charming effect in those lights and shades of expression reflected upon the human face, he would have discovered the feat impracticable without imparting motion to the entire scalp and ears. To have escaped suspicion of slumbering ancestral traits in these days, Nature must have endowed men with the sphinx-like features of wooden dolls. Happily, however, for the universe, she has preferred to run the risk of superfluity in the elaboration of a marvellous and infinite variety.

Mr. Darwin's Confession of Error.

There is a reverse side to arguments drawn from these sources. Superfluous organs have been among the chief stumbling blocks to Natural Selection, and absolutely compelled Mr. Darwin to modify his application of that law. What power can the struggle for life have had upon the amazingly beautiful plumage of birds, upon the exquisite forms and colours of shells, and a million other qualities which give the animal and vegetable

kingdoms the kaleidoscope characters of boundless change. In his "Descent of Man," Vol. I., Mr. Darwin views certain classes of unused organs as a grave obstacle to the acceptance of his theory: "I now admit," he says, "after reading the essay by Nageli on plants, and the remarks by various authors with respect to animals, more especially those recently made by Professor Broca, that in earlier editions of my 'Origin of Species' I probably attributed too much to the action of Natural Selection, or the survival of the fittest. I had not formerly considered the existence of many structures which appear to be, as far as we can judge, neither beneficial nor injurious, and this I believe to be one of the greatest oversights as yet detected in my work" And again, "No doubt, man as well as every other animal, presents structures, which as far as we can judge with our little knowledge, are not now of any service to him, nor have been so during any former period of his existence either in relation to his general conditions of life, or of one sex to the other. Such structures cannot be accounted for by any form of selection, or by the inherited effects of the use and disuse of parts."

"Oh, but," we hear from some one who loves to shelter himself under a great name rather than exercise his own intelligence, "if the theory, instead of finding its evidences plainly written upon every page in the Book of Nature, has to depend upon a maze of vague and contradictory speculations, trivialities, and arguments which, on the confession of evolutionists, tell as much one way as the other, how comes it that any scientific man has accepted the doctrine?" Well, it is not altogether a new discovery that there have always been men who would believe anything rather than admit the possibility of a direct intervention of Deity in the government of the Cosmos. If, however, the query is intended to imply that Darwinism has secured the general concurrence of the scientific world, we join issue at once. Cuvier, Agassiz, and Von Baer, each a giant in the world of science, have already been quoted writing with crushing force against it. We might add Dawson, George Jeffreys, Dana, Oscar Peschel, Wyville Thompson, and a host of others. But let Mr. Darwin himself speak of the acceptance his views had secured after being twenty years before the public. Writing in 1879, little more than two years before his death, he says (*vide* Introduction to the "Descent of Man"): "At least, a large number of naturalists must admit that species are the modified descendants of other species, and this especially holds good with the younger and rising naturalists. The greater number accept the agency of natural selection; though some urge—whether with justice, the future must decide—that I have greatly overrated its importance. Of *the older and honoured chiefs in natural science, many, unfortunately, are still opposed to Evolution in every form.*" Even among the advocates of Darwinism there are two or three sects running widely different theories, and occasionally abusing each other in no measured terms. We have heard Darwin; now, what does Hæckel, his chief apostle in Germany, say? Lashing out violently in reply to an attack which Professor Virchow made upon unscientific theories in a recent address delivered before the German pathologist at Munich, Professor H[*unclear*: re]ckel states:—"In no other city in Germany Evolution in general, and Darwinism in particular, been so little valued, so utterly misunderstood, and treated with such sovereign disdain as in Berlin. . . . Of all conspicuous naturalists of Berlin, only one [Alexander Braun, a botanist] accepted the doctrine of transmutation from the beginning with sincere warmth and full conviction." The feeling in France was best attested by Mr. Darwin's double rejection—in 1870 and 1872—when proposed as a member of the French Academy.

V.

The Uniformity of Creation.

THE evil consequences of starting with a theory and then hunting for evidence to support it, are not confined to those strained deductions from isolated facts, which as we have seen, comprise the stock-in-trade of the Darwinian, but the mind becomes blinded to the true and natural inferences from phenomena which are not exceptional but universal in Nature. Nothing could more forcibly demonstrate this proposition than the confidence with which evolutionists advance, as arguments in their favour, the uniform characteristics of certain structures in widely different animals. In the very oldest fossiliferous strata, said Mr. Denton in his lecture on the "Origin of Man," we see the limbs of the starfish assuming the five-fingered form, or if not five, fifteen, or some multiple of five; so this number five crops out all through the ages—we have it now in the foot and wing of the bird, in the wing of the bat, in the flipper of the whale, and in the hand of man. As the rounds of applause followed this startling evidence of identity, we were irresistibly reminded of that other mystic number, six hundred and sixty-six—the mark of the beast—which an ingenious writer in recent years manipulated with so much dexterity that thousands of worthy simple-minded people were induced to identify Napoleon III. as the veritable beast of the Apocalypse, and the "Destined Monarch of the World." But Napoleon is dead, and with him died the hopes and fears of the believers in his glory and infamy; so, too, many of us will live to see this doctrine of descent banished from the earth by the concentrated force of human intelligence, and by the return

of scientific men from the region of idle speculation to the safe paths of exact observation and utilitarian research.

The five-fingered argument was advanced by Darwin in his "Origin of Species" in these words: "How inexplicable is the similar pattern of the hand of a man, the foot of a dog, the wing of a bat, the flipper of a seal, on the doctrine of independent acts of creation! How simply explained on the principle of the natural selection of successive slight variations in the diverging descendants from a single progenitor." A Creator, it will be observed, should, in Mr. Darwin's opinion, have adopted, in every creature of his handiwork, an entirely new design for organs discharging the same functions. But, not to dwell upon this point, let us read on to learn the "simple explanation" of the evolutionist. Here it is: "We may further venture to believe that the bones in the limbs of the monkey, horse, and bat, were originally developed on the principle of utility, probably through *the reduction of more numerous bones in the fin of some ancient fish-like progenitor of the whole class.*" How very simple! Then, the five-fingered crinoids of the old Laurentian times lost the mystic number by natural selection in "the more numerous bones in the fin of some ancient fish," and then the "more numerous bones" were reduced down again on the "principle of utility" to the original five which were found to answer equally well in the wing of a bat or the hand of a man. Would anyone not arguing from a foregone conclusion, have advanced an explanation so preposterous? On what "principle of utility" are five ribs in the bat's wing of more value than ten; or five fingers more useful than any other number in the flipper of the seal! Is there, indeed, a single physiological fact to prove that a man could not have got through life with as much ease and comfort with four or six toes as with five? We state, unhesitatingly, that there is no such fact. Could there, then, be anything more fatal to the doctrine of Evolution than this very uniformity of structure in individuals whose several characteristics are so widely differentiated. Is it conceivable that if the law of variation had been exercised upon the offspring of any single progenitor for the production of a man, a bat, a seal, and a dog, this non-essential framework could have been preserved in each without variation? How beautifully, however, is this evidence of uniform design—so fatal to any theory of development through countless variations—interpreted by Agassiz: "It exhibits everywhere the working of the same creative mind, through all times, and upon the whole surface of the globe." In his "Essay of Classification," Agassiz supports this position with many convincing observations upon the relations of species to their surrounding conditions, and to each other. The same idea is ably argued by the Duke of Argyle in "The Reign of Law."

But Mr. Darwin in his later years, and Mr. Huxley, his chief disciple, soon perceived the dilemma in which a uniformity without essential utility inevitably landed the doctrine of Natural Selection. It was this discovery that led Mr. Huxley to speak of the argument from unused structures as "two-edged," and compelled Mr. Darwin to modify the claims he had originally advanced on behalf of Natural Selection as the all-potent factor in the evolution of species. One simple example more striking even than that just mentioned will explain the difficulty. It cannot be supposed—nor will any Darwinian dare to contend—that the present relations of the sexes in the propagation of species have not dated back to a period prior to the dawn of mammalian life on the earth. Why then are mammary organs, which are not, and never can have been of use to the male, preserved in his structure? Darwin, as we showed in our last paper, confesses there is no answer from the ethics of evolution to questions like this, which are explained with so much ease simplicity, and overwhelming force by the theory of design in the mind of the great Architect of the Universe.

Impossible as it is for Mr. Darwin to repair these breaks in the chain of his argument, even granting him all his premises, how much wilder would be the attempt if the Spontaneous Generation contented for by Professor Hæckel were conceded. That countless germs of life, springing spontaneously out of matter, should have evolved a uniformity in animal structure coming within the possibility of any sort of classification, is utterly incredible. But we see the plan of One Creative Mind indelibly stamped upon all animated nature, and no variation can ever remove it. The fish of the Mammoth Cave, dwelling in everlasting darkness, may become sightless, but the eye remains to testify to its unity with the whole species; and thousands of organs - useless in an evolutionary sense, unaccountable as the productions of Natural Selection, violating in its first principles the cardinal theory of the Darwinists—are propagated with unflinching uniformity, age after age, producing perfect order amid the infinite variety of exquisite forms and colours, and the perfection of an inexhaustible loveliness. Can anyone consider these things rationally without agreeing with Oscar Peschel that "It is just the new pith of the Darwinian doctrine—namely, Natural Selection—which still remains unaccredited,"

"The Races of Man," by Oscar Peschel (1876).

Spontaneous Generation.

It is scarcely worth while to pursue further the claims advanced on behalf of Spontaneous Generation, Professor Tyndall's crushing reply to Dr. Bastian ends emphatically the contention that there is, up to this moment, one tittle of reliable evidence in favour of inert matter evolving organic life. The fact that Professor

Hæckel—so prolific in theories—has fallen back mainly upon an ingenious invention of his own, known as "carbon generation," shows how frail is the straw to which the believers in Spontaneous Generation frantically cling. Of course, if any man chooses to say with Hæckel, "Though you prove to demonstration that under no conceivable conditions can life be generated spontaneously now, yet I shall still maintain that fifty million years ago, before the loose carbon was deposited in the coal measures, spontaneous generation might have been possible," all argument must end, for science departs into a thing of wild beliefs, and it is idle to follow it. Up to the 17th century Spontaneous Generation was universally accepted. Men saw life springing up wherever conditions were favourable, and they never doubted that heat and moisture gave vitality to the dissolving atoms. But closer observation placed it beyond doubt that the life was the product of eggs or seeds, either deposited by insects or collected from myriads of germs floating in the air. Since then, it has been well said, Spontaneous Generation has retreated further and further with every enlargement of the power of the microscope. The smallest animalcule, it has been found, is possessed of a well-defined organism, and reproduces creatures after its kind by a simple form of self-propagation, Professor Hæckel, emboldened to move out of his safe retreat in the "carbon theory," has advanced a minute marine animalcule, the moneron, which he says possesses only one cell, and might, therefore, possibly exhibit an organism springing direct from matter. But he is obliged to admit that even this humble creature propagates by self-division, and he does not pretend to say that he ever saw any speck of matter transmute itself into one of those simple forms of life. The theory of Spontaneous Generation is one that may perhaps serve its turn in the speculative lecture-room for want of a better, but we should like to see the face of the lecturer if his gardener were to excuse himself for a slovenly seed-bed on the dogma of "spontaneity," and hear the retort upon any seeds man who should venture to try the lecturer's theory as an excuse for the mysterious choking of good turnip seed by a spontaneous evolution of noxious weeds. The scientific tests applied to Spontaneous Generation have been of the most extended and careful character. Professor Schulze (Berlin) records an experiment in which a vessel, prepared under conditions favourable for the production of life, was kept closed from the 28th of May till the beginning of August, and no animal or vegetable organism was produced, but within two days after the flask was opened, animalculæ appeared in abundance. Many experiments of the same character were made by Professor Tyndall, tending to prove that the very lowliest forms of life cannot be produced without the introduction of germs in air or water. The results of the latest of these of experiments were laid before the Royal Institution at this year's series of "before Easter" lectures. Within the last three months we have received from Professor Lionel Beale, F.R.S., President of the Microscopical Society (1881), the most emphatic testimony upon this subject, and there we may safely leave's it. In an address delivered before the Victoria (Philosophical) Institute, London, on the 15th of May last, he said:—"I would draw attention to the declaration again and again repeated, and now taught even to children, that the living and the non-living differ only in degree, that the living has been evolved by degrees from the non-living, and that the latter passes by gradations towards the former state. No one has adduced any evidence in proof of these conclusions, which are, in fact, dictatorial assertions only, and no specimen, of any kind of matter which is actually passing from the non-living to the living state, or which can be shown to establish any connection between these absolutely different conditions of matter, has been, or can be at this time, brought forward. Between purely vital and purely physical actions not the faintest analogy has been shown to exist. The living world is absolutely distinct from the non-living world, and, instead of being a necessary outcome of it, is, compared with the antiquity of matter, probably a very recent addition to it,—not, of course, an addition of mere transformed or modified matter and energy, but of transcendent power conferred on matter, which controls, regulates, and manages both matter and its forces according, it may be, to laws, but not the law of inert matter."

Evolution Refuted by Tue Fauna of New Zealand and Australia.

In his lecture on the "Origin of Man," Mr. Denton, introducing one of those stray local allusions which were wedged into the stereotyped text to give the material freshness, ventured to string a shaft most fatal to himself, Alluding to the total absence of quadrupeds native to New Zealand, he said: "If animals were created, for New Zealand?" He appears, however, to have hardly felt the ground safe, for in his previous delivery of the same lecture he attempted to account for this very singular feature in the fauna of New Zealand by asserting—and there is nothing like a bold front when such statements are advanced—that it was what might have been expected from the geological age of the country, In a full report of his lecture in Chistchurch on "The Age of Beasts and the Advent of Man" we find this passage: "Australia in its animals was behind other parts of the world, which he attributed to its smaller size and position. New Zealand was even more backward than Australia, as it was smaller and more isolated," The question of the geological age of New Zealand may be dismissed in a few sentences, That the country has existed from the remotest ages was positively affirmed by that veteran geologist, Dr. Hochstetter, and is abundantly proved by innumerable geological facts. We do not

know a single authority on the subject who affirms anything else. And if the question were tried by purely evolutionary tests, it would require considerable daring to assert that the ages necessary to develop the moa from a monad would not suffice for the evolution of a kangaroo. A new light, however, has been thrown upon the geological history of New Zealand by the researches of Mr. A. R. Wallace. In that interesting little work, "Island Life," he contends with great force that the characteristics of the New Zealand vegetation prove these islands to be the vestiges of a large Pacific continent extending in a north-westerly direction, and uniting in one mass of land New Zealand, Northern Australia, and New Guinea. New Zealand, therefore, is not only a geologically ancient country, but it is the preserved remnant of a vast continent. Why were its rich virgin lands untenanted by animal life? The answer, to those who believe in a Creation, is easy and reasonable. Creation had a center, and New Zealand, cut off from that center at an early geological period, shares with other islands of the Pacific the absence of every species of quadruped. But what answer can the evolutionist make? The founder of the doctrine of Evolution, Lamarck, at the close of the last century, longed for some ancient specimen of the domesticated dog to demonstrate his theory; the tombs of Egypt gratified the wish only to confound him. More recent disciples have rummaged in the bowels of the earth for some primitive skull to prove man's ignoble ancestry, and the remains of palæolithic man have extorted the confession that he possessed a cranium that might have "belonged to a philosopher." If a council of philosophers were assembled now for the purpose of devising a practical test of Evolution for the guidance of man a million years hence, what would they do but set apart some land in which the conditions are specially favourable for the generation of life, and after depositing the germs, leave the country to develop its own fauna. In New Zealand we have such a country, reserved from a time long anterior to the earliest appearance of mammalian life on the planet. In no country under the sun do animals of every kind multiply more rapidly or attain proportions so magnificent. If it is urged that the climate might, in past ages, have been less kindly, we reply that the vegetation and remains of coral formations afford evidence in the other direction. Why, then, has not Evolution done its work? "Oh," replies some one, "perhaps the germs were not there." Let us see. Shall we go deep down in the Secondary Formation? If so, in the micaceous sandstone cliffs of Waikato South Head and Kawhia, Hochstetter found cephalopods of the genera Ammonite and Belemnite identical with those of Old World celebrity. But that, perhaps, is too far back; well, let us try the Tertiary strata. Why, here are foraminifera common to the Arctic Ocean, the Shetlands, the River Dee, the boulder clays of Cheshire, the North Atlantic, and the Miocene strata of Yarra Yarra (Victoria)—shells fossilised in the Miocene strata that have still direct descendants living in the Mediterranean. But, perhaps, none of these contained the germ of a mammal. What, then, of the fishes that swarm our coasts in shoals? There were flat-fish groping for food along the mud banks, eels wriggling in the river slimes—was none enterprising enough to differentiate its fins into legs and walk ashore? What of those hoofed animals gone astray—the whales and the seals which disported themselves along our coast; was there no temptation to resume their aborted limbs and browse upon the native grasses? Or the birds—did no latent tendency move them to vary into flying squirrels and monkeys? "Yes, but," interposes some one, "what about those birds? How did they get here?" Well, Mr. Wallace, though an evolutionist, thinks it more probable from their characteristics that they flew here than that they reached the country in any other way. Birds unknown previously in New Zealand have made their appearance by migration within the last few years. "But the moa, it could not fly?" No, but Mr. Wallace frankly acknowledges that there is a very much simpler explanation of its presence than any idea of solitary development. He says: "So far as accounting for the presence of wingless birds in New Zealand is concerned, we have nothing whatever to do with any possible connection by way of a Southern continent or Antarctic island with South America and South Africa, because the nearest allies of its moas and kiwis are the cassowaries and emus, and we have distinct indications of a former land extension towards North Australia and New Guinea, which is exactly what we require for the original entrance of the struthious type into New Zealand." Again, "the ancestral struthious type may, like the marsupial, have once spread over the larger portion of the globe. . . . They are present still in Africa—and in New Zealand being isolated they may thus have been preserved."

"Island Life," by A. R. Wallace.

There is no refuge left for the evolutionist but his favourite resort—assertion, and to this he readily betakes himself. New Zealand is too insignificant a theatre for these marvels of Evolution to have been performed upon its soil. One might have supposed that time and favourable climatic conditions were everything, but it appears that there is something in area. The objection can hardly apply to the dimensions of the Pacific Ocean for the development of the ancestral fish; we presume, therefore, that before taking to itself legs, and crawling ashore, it had a careful survey made of the dimensions of the land it proposed to populate, and finding New Zealand too narrow for its philanthropic efforts, it spurned the climate so highly prized by its posterity, and turned away to other countries. Well, suppose we concede the point, and give New Zealand up: is Australia large enough? It comprises an area of 3,000,000 square miles, has a coast line of 8,000 miles, and varieties of climate from the torrid to the temperate. What has it developed? "The kangaroo, of course," we hear. Stop a little; the marsupials

are the very lowest form of mammalia, and made their appearance on the earth in the Triassic period, when they were not peculiar to Australia, but were spread over the greater part of the globe. Why, then, have they continued the only representatives of mammalia that are found on this vast continent? Mr. Wallace supplies us with the only explanation the evolutionist has to give:—"The marsupialia and monotremata are probably the representatives of the lowest organised types of mammal. They once existed in the northern continents, whence *they spread into Australia*, and being isolated and preserved from the competition of the higher forms which soon arose in other parts of the world, they have developed into a variety of types, which, however, still preserve a general uniformity of organisation. One family which continued to exist in Europe in the Miocene period reached America, and has there been preserved till our day."

"The Geographical Distribution of Animals," by A. R. Wallace.

We are to understand, then, that the isolation of the Australian continent, by an intervening sea at a very early period, cut off all access to those higher mammalia which somehow "soon arose" elsewhere, and Australia being left with marsupials only, has never been able to get beyond them. On examining the Damianian genealogical tree, however, we find the marsupialia placed as the unutterably great, great grandfather of every species of mammals. Lines of descent leading out from him give us beasts of prey, seals, whales, bats, insectivora, elephants, monkeys, men, and animals of every shape and colour. How is it that no Australian marsupial was disposed to differentiate into a man or an elephant? One member of the family managed to reach the dimensions of a rhinoceros, as attested by his fossil bones, but he remained a marsupial to the end of the chapter, and his huge proportions did not save him from the fate of the monsters that were simultaneously wandering over the rest of the planet, which ought in any struggle for life to have destroyed all other rivals. Is it credible, that if the tendency to vary and produce new species was latent in the marsupials of Asia, it was absent from the same animal existing in the same geological period on the continent of Australia? To ask us to believe anything of the kind is to seek an assent against reason for a proposition which is disproved by the absolute test of experience to accept a mere speculation against the plainest evidence. The marsupialian ancestry of the whole family of mammals is not simply improbable—it is disproved; and with it go all the theories that have been hung upon it.

VI.

A Retrospect and Summary.

IN preparing these articles the difficulty has not been to find material, but to select the salient points from that mass of evidence which has led the most eminent scientific men of the present century to reject the doctrines espoused by Mr. Darwin, or only to allow them a very minor place in the development of the forms of life now represented upon the earth. It may be admitted that naturalists, in their anxiety for minute classification, have perhaps sometimes drawn the line too tightly between species, and that the observations of Mr. Darwin's partially account for variations within the great families which have appeared in successive ages. But Mr. Darwin's monstrously exaggerated claims on behalf of a very subordinate law in Nature involve such a total reversal of everything we know of the methods by which species maintain their position on the earth, that we should be compelled to reject them if the supporting evidence were a hundred-fold stronger than any that has yet been adduced, and were not contradicted at every step by phenomena which are utterly inexplicable upon the hypothesis of evolution. Mr. Darwin made no attempt to account for the origin of life or sensation; his theory is entirely confined to suggestions regarding possible causes of modification after life had arisen. And those theories, as we have seen, mainly rely for proof upon variations within species exhibited by domestic animals, fanciful resemblances, strained deductions, and purely dogmatic assertions. Professor Owen will not be suspected of prejudice against Mr. Darwin's work when he declares his dispassionate judgment on the observations recorded in "The Origin of Species:" "All these, however, are conceptions of *what may have, not of what have originated a species*. Applied to the structures which differentiate Troglodytes from Homo, or Chiromys from Lemur, they are powerless to explain them, and the structural difference in these instances is greater than in many other species maintaining their distinction by sexual incapacity to produce fertile hybrids."

Owen—"Introduction to Anatomy of Vertebrates." † Hæckel—"History of the Creation," vol 1.

Before glancing again at the ground over which we have passed, it is desirable to consider what the Darwinians really ask people to believe. Professor Hæckel requires them to picture "the primeval parents of all other organisms," in some microscopic "homogeneous organisms as are yet not differentiated, and are similar to the inorganic crystals in being homogeneously composed of one single substance." † These organisms presumably made their first appearance on the planet at the bottom of some sea in the Laurentian period. Let us first imagine the task set out for this simple germ without sensation, and hardly visible under the most powerful

microscope, and conceive, if we can, any possible variation, or any struggle for life, by which might be evolved from it the order, the variety, the beauty of Animated Nature. Think for one moment of the delicate mechanism of the human body, in no portion of which can a pin's point be inserted without perforating a nerve and a blood-vessel. An obtuseness bordering upon intellectual stupidity is necessary to believe that these and myriads of other effects, visible everywhere around, find any rational explanation in such absurdly inadequate causes as Mr. Darwin and his apostles offer. Mr. Denton candidly confessed that he could no more believe that such results were the product of accidental variation than he believed that a rock rolling downhill had sculptured the statue of the Duke of Wellington. Nor can any other reasonable man do so who is not wilfully self-blinded. The entire attitude of evolutionists of the true Darwinian school is utterly absurd and inconsistent. In the occurrence of rude flints in caves and gravel beds, disassociated from human remains, they perceive and confidently assert the presence of man, and yet they can survey a Creation in which law, order, and marvellous design are universal, and declare it to be the product of a succession of accidents. One achievement of this new development of teleology, as interpreted by Huxley, is the demonstration to those ignorant people who conceived that eyes were made to see with, that they are labouring under a sad delusion—the eye, we are assured, is simply the effect of outward impressions on a piece of sensitive skin! The skin that would produce the eye, the reasons for its production and location, are, however, left to the imagination; they are nowhere to be found in Nature. When an eye in process of evolution is discovered, or when any explanation of the development of an organ of such characteristic shape and delicate construction, by variation and Natural Selection, is vouchsafed by Mr. Huxley, we shall begin to believe in the doctrine of Evolution. It is a perfectly safe challenge. Not the liveliest imagination in a scientific school so fertile in fancies and so bankrupt in facts as the evolutionists are has ever formulated even a plausible theory to account for the production in an eyeless creature of the eye, with its lenses, optic nerve, protective covering, socket, and appropriate muscles.

The very possibility of variation in marine monads is simple assumption. Dr. Wyville Thomson, of H.M. 'Challenger' scientific expedition, declares that his eight years' observation of the ocean fauna "refuse to give the least support to the theory which refers the evolution of species to extreme variation guided by natural selection," and Professor J. Gwyn Jeffries says he "cannot understand how either natural or sexual selection call affect the marine invertebrates, which have no occasion to struggle for their existence, and have no distinction of sex." We prefer these observations to volume of Huxley's and Hæckel's theories, however ingenious and plausible. We have rummaged those theories in vain for a single intelligent answer to the question before propounded: Why, if these forms are constantly developing towards the possession of eyes and ears, Nature's inevitable failures are nowhere to be found? Everywhere creatures are perfect after their kind. Mr. Darwin says: "The most humble organism is something much higher than the inorganic dust under our feet; and no one with an unbiassed mind can study any living creature, however humble, without being struck with enthusiasm at its marvellous structure and properties."

Darwin—"Descent of Man."

First of all, then, we see a fixed and impassable gulf between the organic and the inorganic—the living and the dead. Next, we have the perfection of every type of life after its own order, a perfection that must have been subject to constant and notable exceptions if the higher species were the products of variations in the lower. Persistence of species is the universal order of the universe, and variation is limited by unfruitfulness—even the double flowers, accidentally or artificially produced, are barren. Mr. Darwin admits that "Some groups, as we have seen, have endured from the earliest known dawn of life to the present day."

Darwin—"Origin of Species."

[The genus *lingula* is an example.]

If from a few simple forms possessing powers of self-development, all life has sprung, why are there such extraordinary differences in size now. The age of minute creatures ought to have passed away long ago. If the same germ produced the mouse and the elephant, it is inexplicable why evolution stopped at the mouse stage in the one case and went on to the elephant in the other. Weakly mice ought to have been killed of, giving place to a stronger race; these, by natural selection should again have given birth to progeny on the average larger and stronger than their ancestors, and the process going on *ad infinitum*, ought to have brought the species up to the size of dogs, at a low computation. The same course of reasoning might be applied with equal or greater force to other animals—to insects, birds, and every species of fish between the minnow and the shark. There are myriads of living creatures as minute and organically simple as any that could have existed at the first dawn of life on the planet, and their continued re-production discredits the belief in the possession of inherent capacities for progression. The reply of the evolutionist that these forms of life continue to exist because there is room for them; and further, that Natural Selection does not cause favourable variations but only preserves them when they occur, is thoroughly unsatisfactory. The first reason is simply a denial of the theory of the Survival of the Fittest, for it recognises that not only the theoretically fit but the unfit survive; and the second reply reduces the whole system to the wildest of chances, and is repudiated by every intelligent observation of the facts of Nature.

If evolution has brought the monad up to the higher animal or the man, it has gone on steadily in one direction, and must, therefore, have been the product of some powerful law. That law, however, to be indicative of an inherent property of matter or of vitality, should have been uniform in its operation, and all creatures ought to have developed gradually into higher forms, whereas the highly organised animals are only as a few blades of grass in a prairie when compared with the abounding forms of lowly life maintaining their place and identity on the earth.

We have asserted that the geological strata are adverse to the theory of Evolution. The fact that Lyell, after 30 years' study of the fossils of the earth's crust, and so long as he relied on his own observations, was found writing against transmutation of species is sufficiently significant; but specific facts tending in the same direction might be multiplied indefinitely. Suddenly in the Silurian rocks, contemporaneously with the humble cephalaspis, appears a shark—the very highest type of fishes, although lower forms, afterwards known to us, are nowhere to be found in these rocks. Again, in the Permian Period, lizards abruptly make their appearance which, upon Professor Huxley's own admission, "Differ astonishingly little from the lizards which exist at the present day." And Mr. Huxley is compelled to acknowledge that though these lizards continued almost without variation, and can be traced down through the succeeding strata to the present time, "We find no trace of lizards, nor of any reptile whatever in the whole mass of formations beneath the Permian," Nor are there any intermediary forms. Abruptly, again, in the Triassic age, gigantic saurians come on the scene, reptiles more highly organised than any now existing, thirty-two species of three-toed birds, four times larger than the ostrich (probably the immediate relatives of the New Zealand Moa) and marsupialian mammalia. Again Evolution is at fault—no intermediary forms have ever been found. Mr. Huxley lamely resorts to the plea of defects in the geological record: "For my part," he observes, "I entertain no sort of doubt that the reptiles, birds, and mammals, of the Trias, are the direct descendants of the reptiles, birds, and mammals which existed in the latter part of the Paleozoic epoch, but not in any area of the present dry land which has been explored by the geologist."

Huxley—"Crit and Addresses."

Professor Hæckel, speaking of the reptiles, says: "In the present state of our knowledge we are obliged to give up the attempt at establishing their pedigree,"

Hæckel—"History of the Creation," vol. 2.

Principal Dawson says: "Physically, the transition from the Permian to the Trias is easy. In the domain of life a great gulf lies between. The geologist whose mind is filled with the forms of the Paleozoic period, on rising into the next succeeding bed, feels himself a sort of Rip Van Winkle, who has slept a hundred years and awakes in a new world."

Dawson—"The Origin of the World."

In the Oolitic, and again in the Tertiary strata the same thing occurs. Professor Williamson says of the transition from the Eocene to the Miocene: "Remember, then, that in the lowest part of the Tertiary series we have scarcely any of these mammals. The few found in the Eocene period are but scanty representatives of the group, but when we turn a corner it appears as if some great magician had waved his hand, and, in response to the magic summons, life of the most varied character and in *forms most dissimilar from what immediately preceded* flash into existence."

Williamson—"Succession of Life on the Earth."

Mr. Denton confessed that he had himself seen evidence of the disappearance of one set of fossils and the succession of a totally different set, having no relationship to those below, within the space of two or three feet—an occurrence in which the theory of Evolution was utterly untenable. Speaking of the great sub-kingdoms into which Animated Nature is divided, Mr. Huxley says:—"So definitely and precisely marked is the structure of each animal that in the present state of our knowledge there is not the least evidence to prove that a form in the slightest degree transitional between any of the two groups of vertebrated annulosa, mollusca, and cœlenterata either exists or has existed during that period of the earth's history which is recorded by the geologist."

Huxley—"Lay Sermon."

Upon what, then, it will naturally be asked, do the evolutionists rely in refutation of the mass of facts of which we have only indicated the barest outline? Their stock of arguments, which are reiterated with a wearisome monotony of barrenness, has afforded the narrow track marking the limits of these papers: Variations in domesticity and under cultivation, far-fetched deductions from animal resemblances, rudimentary organs, embryology. A little novelty was given to the oft-told story by Mr. Huxley's attempt in the New York lectures to trace the pedigree of the horse in certain resemblances exhibited by the teeth and limbs of the little Orohippus; but while careful to dwell upon points of similarity, the lecturer very scrupulously excluded all references to the many differences which discredit his theory. The idea that the archæopteryx was intermediate between the reptile and the bird was early demolished by Professor Owen's identification of the fossil as the

remains of a true bird—and thousands of birds had existed on the earth ages before it.

Every test that has ever been suggested to determine the power of variation to alter species has resulted adversely to Evolution. The mummies of Egypt prove that four or five thousand years of evolution have left man and domestic animals structurally unchanged, and the discovery of human skulls, giving the evolutionists a still wider range of time, has extorted the confession that their theory receives no support from the comparison. We have offered them, in the fauna of New Zealand and Australia, a period extending from the earliest dawn of life on the earth till now, and the answer is still the same. Are we, then, to accept Mr. Darwin's theories and opinions and possibilities against the teachings of recognized facts, the force of which evolutionists are compelled to acknowledge? To do so is to undermine the very foundations of exact science, and drive it from the secure fortress of ascertained truths into a thing of creeds and beliefs.

Passing on to the most paraded arguments of Darwinists—Reversions, Embryology, and Rudimentary Organs—we have seen that these things, when not ridiculously inconsequential, turn fatally against Evolution. The existence of unused organs strikes a deadly blow at the law of Natural Selection, which insists on the conservation only of variations that are beneficial and useful to a species. So strongly is this position supported that Mr. Darwin withdrew many of the claims he had originally advanced on behalf of his pet theory.

Proof of a Creation.

Having, therefore, seen the very foundations of Darwinism crumble away wherever a test is applied, we now come to consider Mr. Denton's favourite barricade: "I challenge anyone," said he, "to adduce scientific evidence of a Creation." If by that we are to understand that no one is equal in those days to the manufacture of a living being we leave him and his co-believers in spontaneous generation in undisputed possession of the field. If, however, he means evidence such as we ordinarily accept as a demonstration of creation when applied to the production of any article of human manufacture, we retort that there is overwhelming evidence in thousands of instances. We see a creature spring suddenly into being without parentage., endowed with life., and exhibiting a structure marvellously designed; and, applying our ordinary modes of reasoning, we say it is the handiwork of a higher intelligence. Let us suppose Mr. Huxley wandering with his friend Professor Hæckel in the midst of a trackless and uninhabited desert, when they stumble upon a well-built house. Mr. Huxley says: "Some man has been this way before us." "Oh, no," responds Hæckel, "that's impossible; look at the country, no man could live here—that house has got there by chance—it his sprung up spontaneously, or the wind has blown it from the nearest town." Huxley retorts, "Why, there are the foundations well laid, and the house is constructed of such excellent proportions that not only a man, but a very intelligent one has been at work." Hæckel, however, persists that the thing is impossible, and Huxley leaves him to his theory as a harmless sort of monomania. Instead of a miserable house, we have exquisitely-formed creatures, into the intricacies of whose structure and processes of self-development human intelligence has failed to penetrate; and yet Mr. Huxley cannot perceive any insanity in attributing this to chance. "Ah!" says Mr. Denton, "I agree with you there—the thing is utterly incredible: but then it is 'Spiritual tendency in Nature supplies the key.'" Despite the most earnest and respectful solicitation no definition of this "Spiritual tendency" has yet been offered; and if it had, there is a serious obstacle to its acceptance in the overwhelming weight of evidence against any succession of life by transmutation of one species into another. We are very apt to deceive ourselves with high-sounding phrases. What is this "Spiritual tendency," and how does it operate? To produce the marvellous results in vegetable and animal life visible everywhere around us, it must either be something transmittable physically in matter, or else a constantly-operating miracle. It is surely easier of belief that creatures were called into existence by the working of the Creative Will, and endowed with all the powers necessary for perpetuating their species, after their own order, than that they have been moulded into shape by any "spiritual tendency," acting miraculously outside them, changing primitive forms, in the course of countless ages, to some ideal of which the original creatures were utterly unconscious.

If, however, Creation, in these days, is outside our own experience, Mr. Denton has assured us it is within his. He has gravely stated that a spasmodic female, sitting in trance condition, can materialise out of the air the substance of the human body. He has, himself, if we may believe him, taken casts in clay of hands so created. He refers us with perfect faith to Professor Crookes, who declares that he has hugged the full figure of a materialised spirit of the feminine gender, and found it very substantial. He points us to Professor Zollner, who testifies that a gold ring was taken from his finger and passed through that solid substance of a series of wooden boxes locked one within another, without the boxes being opened or the material of the ring: or the wood injured. The man who believes all this and asks us to show him a creation, or doubts the power of Deity to do wonders less repugnant to our knowledge of the properties of material substances than a belief in Zollner's ring experiment demands, is surely somewhat unreasonable in his alternations of scepticism and credulity.

Evolution in the Production of Sensation and Mind.

Let us now look for a moment at Evolution from another aspect. If it has broken down in its attempted explanations of the physical structure, how much more lamentably has it failed to throw the faintest light upon sensation, the mental powers, and spiritual existence. Darwin felt that it was folly to make the attempt; these phenomena were beyond the sphere of his philosophy. He says:—"In what manner the mental powers were first developed in the lower organisms is as hopeless an inquiry as how life itself first originated. These are problems for the distant future, if they are ever to be solved by man."

Darwin—"Descent of Man," page 66.

But it is just the mental power that makes the man; not his animal structure and propensities. A theory of the origin of man, without taking into account his mental and moral powers, is a veritable Hamlet, with the prince left out. And Darwinism in every shape is confessedly that theory. The smallest male human skull has twice the brain capacity of the largest gorilla, but the proportion of 2 to 1 is not fractionally typical of the vast gulf fixed between man's intelligence and moral powers and the highest type of animal (which Mr. Wallace justly observes would not be found in any of the monkey species, but in the elephant or dog). The quality of the brain substance is more important than its size. Some of the very largest healthy brains have been found in men and women without intellectual capacity, and heads average larger in size in high than in equatorial latitudes, irrespective of the average intelligence. A certain amount of brain is indispensable to the discharge of merely animal functions. An infant eighteen months old exhibits infinitely higher intellectual powers than an ape of mature age—it has made great progress in the acquisition of language, exhibits keen mental emotions, and applies reasons drawn from one set of observations to a totally different set of circumstances, with perfect accuracy. The gap between man and the ape, which structurally evolutionists confess to be bridgeless, is mentally and morally removed to a degree that places the possibility of a distant affinity beyond credence. Mistaken ideas of the intellectual status of barbarous races, alluded to in another place, have had something to do with the belief that this chasm might one day be spanned by future discovery. Man contains in his own person the complete answer to the evolutionist. The fruit of the ages, he is symbolical of everything which in an evolutionary sense is a weakness. The most helpless of all creatures; for the first year of his life unable to walk, and for many years incapable of supplying his own bodily necessities; utterly destitute of clothing, without claws or teeth, or physical strength or swiftness, to procure for himself food or safety, it is, as Sir John Lubbock acknowledges, extraordinary that he should have held his own against the terrible enemies that roamed the earth.

Lubbock—Origin of Civilization.

His intelligence—the sole means of his preservation—could not have always belonged to him if he were the product of evolution, and for its acquisition evolution offers no explanation.

The Moral and Spiritual Aspects of the Question.

When we pass from the mental to the moral and spiritual senses of man, inherited variations, natural selection, and all the puny artillery of the evolutionist are trundled off the battle-field. They cannot explain the power of thought, how much less can they approach that "still small voice" of conscience which is unwearied in its protests against all the animal instincts, the sharp claws, the ruthless crushing down of weaker members, which is the essence of evolutionary ethics, and is elevated by its philosophy into a divine law. If Darwinism, as interpreted by its advanced exponents, is true, the conscious instinct of immortality, constant and universal in the human mind, is alike a fraud and an inexplicable phenomenon. Grant the widest latitude to every evolutionary principle, and it is incapable of generating aught that is not purely physical—nothing that is beyond material causation. Cold, dead, senseless matter could never have originated a spiritual essence distinct from itself; and with the return of the original elements to the dust must go for ever the influence of heredity, natural selection, tendency, and all the laws or processes which originally fashioned and developed the perfect being. There is no logical escape from this position except by the admission of miracle at some stage, and the supervising control of a personal Deity. And where does the doctrine of Evolution, viewed in its strictly logical and materialistic sense, land its votaries, save in the presence of the Infinite and Unknowable. Eloquently declaimed that eminent French physiologist, M. Pasteur, upon this subject at a meeting of the French Academy on the 27th of April last; "He who proclaims the existence of an infinite—and no one can evade it—asserts more of the supernatural in that affirmation than exists in all the miracles of all religions; for the notion of the infinite has the twofold character of being irresistible and incomprehensible. When this notion surges on the mind there is nothing left but to bend the knee. In that anxious moment all the springs of intellectual life threaten to snap, find one feels near being seized with the sublime madness of Pascal."

Of what possible use is this doctrine of Evolution to a to a humanity which craves for living realities to quicken its pulses of action and Impel it, onward to a higher destiny? If we want brute types we have not, alas, to seek for them in fossil bones. It has been vauntingly said that science is to regenerate the world and create the religion of the future. The veneration and humility of a Newton and a Herschel might have done this, but what has the world ever owed to the arrogant exponents of Darwinism? To the true workers in mechanics and science—the Watts, the Arkwrights, the Stephensons, the Faradays, the Davys, the the Morses, the Edisons, and hundreds of others who are workers, not talkers, the world owes much, and will yet owe more. But what is the amount of its debt to the Darwins, the Hæckels, and the Huxleys that we should acknowledge their claims to fill the whole field in science, in religion, and philosophy? Look around on the crushed-down masses struggling sorrowfully but bravely amid the weight of inequable surroundings for some glimpse of the noble and divine. What consolation, what hope is there for them in this creed, which makes the instruments of success in a fight for brute supremacy its Alpha and Omega, and selfishness the governing law of life? Read by its light, philanthropy, patriotism, and all those deeds of self-sacrifice which give nobility to the soul, are amiable weaknesses. Is this the creed that is destined to regenerate the world, and achieve what the inculcation of virtue as a duty alike to God and man has failed in accomplishing? Let those who believe it go on searching with their mole-like eyes for some new bone to link man to the brutes: what can they know of those higher truths that are revealed, not to the intellect, but direct to the heart—the indwelling spirit of man? Still will there be thousands, with quickened spiritual insight, seeking after some new trace of the God-like in humanity, and carrying with them the panting heart of the people. Still will the conscious living presence of God's spirit in the soul of man bring to him a perfect rest, lifting him above and beyond the mournful incongruities of his material circumstances, and nerving him to the endurance of those human cares, and the performance of those hard, unyielding human duties, which fall to the lot of mankind. Still will humanity draw new hopes, new aspirations, new impulses to virtue, and new consolation from that image of the Infinite Spirit reflected in a perfect humanity. And when Darwin and his apostles shall have been forgotten, still will be heard, in ever-growing fervour, welling up from the depths of man's spiritual nature, the song and the prayer—

*Rock of Ages, cleft for me,
Let me hide myself in thee.*

Vignette

Auckland, N.Z.,

H. Brett, Commercial and General Printer, "Star" Office, Wyndham Street, Near National Bank.

What is Freethought? An Address delivered by Robert Stout President of the Dunedin Freethought Association, At the Opening of the Lyceum Hall, on Sunday, 30th April, 1882. Price Sixpence.
Dunedin: Joseph Braithwaite, Bookseller and Publisher Corner of High Street and Arcade. 1882.

Note.—

In the reading of this address I occasionally enlarged on my topic, giving illustration, and somewhat amplifying my arguments. I have no record of these remarks, and I therefore publish the notes I had written before I spoke. As it was a spoken address I did not give all my authorities, but I may state that I consulted the following amongst other works:—Wilkinson's "Ancient Egypt," Records of the Past," Draper's "Religion and Science," White's "Warfare of Science," Lecky's "Rationalism," Trubner's "Oriental Series," the "Hibbert Trust Lectures," Burton's "History of Scotland," etc., etc.

ROBERT STOUT.

"What is Freethought?"

vignette

To-Night I propose to answer a question that is often put, and to which the replies are various. What, it is asked, is Freethought? This is, I think, a fitting time to attempt to answer the question. We are opening a new Hall built for the express purpose of maintaining a free platform in this city, and having our children trained to approach the problems of life without being encumbered by the creeds of the past. Let us, then, see if we can define our position. We claim to be a Freethought Association—that is, a body of men and women united to assist each other in the investigation of life problems, and yet without a creed, and without a "sanction" for our

opinion. I use sanction in the philosophical legal sense; that is, a man may denounce us, may abuse the position we take up, and yet we threaten him with no punishment. To use the elegant language of a modern defender of the faith, and a champion of the Young Men's Christian Association of Dunedin, "He may spit on our creed, and he will pass scathless." Of course, a man who does this, or speaks like this, has only attained a certain intellectual position, and we may consider that his position is a sufficient punishment. But we are unlike what are termed other religious associations in this respect. If a man denies their creed, he is threatened with all kinds of penalties. I do not require to allude to social penalties, nor to the abuse or misrepresentation that he is almost bound to receive, nor to the loss of political rights and citizenship privileges, which in some countries he must sustain: but I refer to the threat of future punishment. Every creed almost threatens future penalties. If a man does not believe as the Catholic Church or the Protestant Churches believe, woe to him. Why is it, then, we run a risk? Some people have said, "Well, if you are correct, we are safe; but if we are right, you'll suffer." People, who are cowardly enough to approach the consideration of any questions in this way, are not thinkers. With Martineau we must believe that if we search for truth, we must not be casting sidelong glances after our soul's salvation. But do not let us assume that a Freethinker is necessarily one who is outside a church. There are, no doubt, Freethinkers in many churches. Every now and again one more pronounced than another is excommunicated. If he is a professor, for example, and if he applies to the study of the Bible the same canons of criticism as he would to the study of the Greek Bible, the Iliad of Homer, or to the reading of Shakespeare then he will be thrown out of his professorship. Or if he tries to explain Exodus or Leviticus according to arithmetic, he will meet with the fate of Bishop Colenso. Freethought is really a mode of thought. And wherever there is the mode there is the Freethinker, whether he is in or out of the church. And if, as I say, Freethought is a mode of thought, this being remembered will correct an error that is often made. It is assumed that all those outside the churches are Freethinkers. This is incorrect. Before a man can be a Freethinker, he must have thought. There are some who care nothing for theological or philosophical questions. They eat, drink, work, sleep, and enjoy themselves. To them life has no problem, save how to live. Whence is man, or whither? Is the race progressing, or is its Eden in the past? These and other questions never trouble them. They have no creed, and they care for none of these things. It would, therefore, be as reasonable to assume that all who register themselves as belonging to a religious denomination are orthodox, as to assume that those who belong to no church are Freethinkers. Before one can be a Freethinker, there must be an admission that there is something to think about. No doubt, the interest may vary. Temperaments vary. Early training counts for a good deal, and so do social surroundings. There must, however, be some enquiry, some doubt, some thought.

Freethought, then, implies some thought; and if any one asks what is a Freethinker, we must reply, one to whom there has come the need of considering some questions concerning man and his relation to the universe; and, secondly, that he has the right to consider them unfettered by any Church, by any state, by any Society; and, thirdly, there is his mode of search. He has to be guided by only one thing, those canons of evidence that will enable him to sift his subject to the bottom. He cares nothing for anathema, nor excommunication, nor threats of personal suffering here, or hereafter. He is the analyst; nay, more, he must ever be searching for truth. To him there is no rest. He may accept—nay, must accept—certain things as true; but even these—until he thinks the induction complete—he only accepts provisionally. And his attitude must ever be a waiting for further enlightenment. The emblems outside our Hall are never forgotten:—Liberty: He must be free as the air; Justice: He must, without bias and with unerring fidelity, weigh every fact as if his very existence depended on the scales being fairly, justly, truly held.

Now, this method of investigation is not confined to one subject. Indeed, I may here at once say that it is the only method that has been fruitful in the past. If ever there has been an advance made in Religion, in Science, or in Philosophy, it has always been made by adopting this method. We, however, as an Association do not pretend to be a Scientific Institute, nor are we a Literary Club nor a Philosophical Society, As an Association, we claim to bring to the test I have mentioned the popular religions of to-day, and we unite for mutual help in our investigation and for mutual assistance, knowing that organisation is required to maintain intact our right to make such enquiries.

We have only to glance at history to see that there has been ever a conflict between the old and the new, between authority and freedom, between religion and science. Nay, the conflict is not yet ended. He who dares to doubt the popular explanation of the cosmos, and of man's relation to the universe, is denounced now as he was six hundred—nay, two thousand years ago. It is true there is not the same power in the hands of those in authority now; but there is still left a remnant of the old spirit, and there is still the same impatience manifested with the sceptic. Now, if a man has got peace in believing he can never be a Freethinker—he has no doubts to solve—he is intellectually anchored, and though this intellectual rest may mean intellectual death, still he is not troubled. He is at rest. A Freethinker, however, is never at rest. He is ever searching for something new, and he is ever analysing what is presented to him for belief or as a fact. There seem to me to be three attitudes a man may assume to the religious and quasi-religious questions of to-day.

There is, first, the attitude of the man who believes, and acts on the belief, that in some church organisation there is deposited the truth, and that its officers can tell him authoritatively what to believe, and what not to believe. This man does no thinking. The Church does it for him.

There is, second, the position of the man who believes that in some book, or collection of books, he can find all his problems solved—what he has to believe, and what he has to do.

There is, third, the man who accepts the authority of no Church and of no book, but believes that man has not yet discovered the truth, and who joins with others in the search.

In the past we have often seen those who take up the first two positions, joining their forces to put down—to punish—nay, to drive out of existence, those who took up the third position. And our newspapers of to-day show, that, even yet, they may unite to punish one whose attitude is different from theirs.

The treatment of Mr. Bradlaugh, M.P., for example.

And, if we look back, we will find that the history of civilisation is, after all, but a record of the struggle that has taken place between those who took up the third—the Freethought position—and those who took up the Catholic or Protestant positions, I do not say that all those who claimed to think for themselves were necessarily heretical. Often they did not seem to see the force of their own arguments, nor whither their position led them. Often, also, they took up positions in science that they thought did not conflict with the popular theology. But what I do say is this, that the only progress that has been attained, has been by taking the third attitude. The history of all the sciences shows us this.

Let us take astronomy. I take it first because now a days no one thinks of astronomical theories being heretical. The astronomer may start the wildest hypothesis imaginable—may announce a theory that has, perhaps, few facts, and little analogy, if any, to back it: but no one thinks of sitting down to fight it by pointing out that it is contrary to the popular theology. I do not say astronomy is looked on as religious. Telling people of the grandeur of the heavens, of their immensity, of their beauty, their sublimity, and their wonderful mechanism, is still in some places not a fit subject for a Sunday evening lecture.

I refer to the Proctor episode in Sydney, New South Wales.

But still no one denounces an astronomer as necessarily irreligious. An astronomer may now say there are 221 planets, or more, and he is not heretical. It was not always so. To say there were more than seven was thought contrary to true religion. And what did the Churches teach? The earth, and not the sun, was the centre of our universe. The sun, moon, and stars were created to give light to the earth. And one whose philosophy, one Church asserts, can alone save the race—St. Thomas Aquinas—proved to the satisfaction of himself and his Church that the earth was the centre round which the sun moved. And who can read the record of Copernicus's life, of Bruno's life, of Kepler's life, of Galileo's life, without feeling sad? Copernicus had to quit Rome, and Dr. White says he could send his book neither to Rome—the seat of the Catholicism—nor to Wittenberg—the seat of Protestantism—because Copernicus's theory and Scripture did not harmonise. His book, when published, was placed where many good books have been placed, on the index, and to "read it was to risk damnation." The attitude of the Protestant Church was not much different. Dr. White says:—

"Doubtless many will at once exclaim against the Roman Catholic Church for this, justice compels me to say, that the founders of Protestantism were no less zealous against the new scientific doctrine. Said Martin Luther: 'People gave ear to an upstart astrologer, who strove to show that the earth revolves, not the heavens or the firmament, the sun, and the moon. Whoever wishes to appear clever must devise some new system, which of all systems is, of course, the very best. This fool wishes to reverse the entire science of astronomy. But Sacred Scripture tells us that Joshua commanded the sun to stand still, and not the earth.'" Melancthon agreed with Luther. And Bruno—Giordano Bruno—because he asserted what is now taught in every Church school in the world, was burned. And need I allude to Galileo's treatment. He, like Copernicus and Bruno, was called an Atheist, was imprisoned, was dragged before that terrible institution, the Inquisition, and forced, in order to save his life, to confess that the sun moved round the earth, and not the earth round the sun. And even after his abjuration he was kept imprisoned till he was blind, and even after that treated harshly, and his death did not even end the virulence of his enemies, He was denied Catholic burial—the last weapon of the Church. And now, in less than 300 years, the very Church that condemned him, teaches his doctrine.

If we refer to geography we have the same story. Lactantius denied the possibility of the Antipodes, so did Augustine, I quote what the latter said from "The City of God":—

"But as to the fable that there are Antipodes, that is to say, men on the opposite side of the earth, where the sun rises when it sets to us, men who walk with their feet opposite ours—that is, on no ground credible. And, indeed, it is not affirmed that this has been learned by historical knowledge, but by scientific conjectures on the ground that the earth is suspended within the concavity of the sky and that it has as much room on the one side of it as on the other: hence they say that the part which is beneath must also be inhabited. . . . For Scripture, which proves the truth of its historical statements by the accomplishment of its prophecies, gives no false information, and it is too absurd to say, that some men might have taken ship and traversed the whole wide

ocean, and crossed from this side of the earth to the other, and that thus even the inhabitants of that distant region are descended from that one first man."—(*"The City of God," translated by Rev. Marcus Dods.*) *"How could the earth be round, for were not all people to see the Lord descending at the last day out of the clouds," Sec Draper's "Conflict of Science and Religion," page 64.*

I have mentioned astronomy and geography, as nowadays an astronomer may propound what theories he likes, and a geographer may make what discoveries he pleases, and yet not be accounted heretical. But if we take geology, we see the warfare, between authority and Freethought, still raging. Step by step, those who have rolled on the Church and the Bible have had to retreat. The fight is, however, still prolonged. Lyell, in his "Principles of Geology," sketches the growth of the science of geology. People who accepted the account in Genesis needed no search for a theory of how the earth attained its present position. The record was in Genesis; why search for the history in the rocks? If we do not go back further than the seventeenth century, we see all geological research retarded, because the churches said that all the fossils were the remains of the Noahic deluge, that any one that said otherwise was a heretic, meriting punishment. Still, it was some advance to admit that the fossils were the remains of animals and plants that had once lived. A hundred years before that, it had been said they were not the remains of living things, but were mere sports of Nature, or as a child would to-day name a thing he did not understand—they were "funny things." If it was shown that it was impossible that the fossils could all have been deposited by a deluge, then the geologist who said so was denounced as impious and a contemner of Scripture. The theologians had, however, to give up the deluge theory of fossils, and then came the giving up of the six natural days of creation, then the extension of the age of the earth. The last battle is yet being fought. It is about the age of man. Some people about two centuries ago believed that the fossil remains of a big lizard were the remains of antediluvian man. And this year we have had repeated in Dunedin that the Cromagnon race was also antediluvian. Who can forget the bitter cry raised when Lyell's "Antiquity of Man" appeared? And let any lecturer state any geological facts opposed to the present popular theology, and he is at once condemned. No sadder record can be read, than that of the difficulties that have been thrown in the way of all scientific investigation by the churches. So far as geology was concerned, the Protestant churches were even more vehement in condemning geologists than the Catholic Church. Nor can we wonder at their opposition. Two root doctrines of the popular theology have been destroyed by astronomy and geology. I do not require to point out that the reliability of the record in Genesis must be given up. Able and learned theologians, in both Catholic and Protestant Churches, have seen that, and hence the statement that Genesis is not meant to teach geology, that it is a poem, a liturgy, anything, in fact, but a scientific record. But I refer to the doctrine, first, that the whole universe, so to speak, centred round our earth. The Bible story is that everything was created, everything designed, with reference to the earth and to man. And when astronomy shows us that this earth is but a speck amongst 75,000,000 worlds at the least, how can we reconcile the Bible with science. And the other doctrine that geology has proved false was, that death came into the world as the punishment for eating the apple. Millions of years before man lived there had been death. The whole of the globe bore its traces, and was man created or evolved different to other animals? Death was part of the very constitution of the world. And if these two doctrines are exploded, what comes of the superstructure based on them? How can Christianity be true if the story of the apple is false? How can the Christian system be true if its basis is cut away?

But there has grown up by Freethought, the recognition of a law, whose effects as changing the popular creeds we have not yet realised. In the starry heavens and in the bowels of earth alike we find law. No doubt there have been cataclysms, but even these display a uniformity. Everything seems brought under the domain of law. There are few leaps; slow changes are the rule. We see this in the heavens, and geology shows how slowly species followed species, genera genera. From the study of these sciences and from observing plants and animals, we have had formulated the law of Evolution. As when the motion of the earth was first mentioned, so when Darwin and Wallace published their books, there was hardly an orthodox pulpit, but denounced the doctrine as heretical, and damnable. And, in Dunedin only three years ago, one clergyman was not deemed fit to become a member of the Young Men's Christian Association, because he said he believed in Evolution. Could I give you a better example of what Freethought, as opposed to the popular theology, means?

I do not need to point out to you how vital Evolution has been. It has altered almost all our natural sciences, and I do not know any that is not based on it. The theory opposed to it of a special creation of all things just as we see them now, how few of the intelligent believe? That millions of years ago there was first created light; then the firmament; then herbs, plants, and fruit trees; then sun, moon, and stars; then fishes and birds; then creeping things, beasts, and man, few geologists or scientific men assert. It is now proposed to get rid of the Evolution doctrine, by supposing some direct specific interventions—creative waves, so to speak. Why is this supposition started? It is a last effort to prove that Genesis's record is true. The use of the Evolution hypothesis has not, however, been confined to biology or geology. It has created anthropology. It has shown us how language has grown. Who now believes the story of the Tower of Babel? Fancy a Professor of the Science of Language, beginning by stating he believed that myth. The learned, from Lapland to Stewart Island, from the

East to the West, would laugh at him. And it has proved to us that religions, just like species of animals, have been slowly evolved out of prior religions. Let us take even the growth of Christianity. The way some people talk you would imagine that the Christian system sprang all at once into life, and that it was not indebted to the preceding system. But the slightest enquiry will show us that no new religion springs at once into life. Its main elements exist before it exists. Buddhism was indebted to Brahminism; Mahometanism, to Judaism and Christianity; and the religion of Israel had much of the Egyptian mythology. So with Christianity. It took centuries before it reached the development we now see. It had not a pope at first; it had no bishops once, nor synods; its Church government was a growth, and it borrowed for its development not only from its Jewish forerunner, but also from the Pagan religions around it.

See Hatch's "Bampton Lectures, 1880."

In its Church rites we see traces of old customs extending far back into antiquity, and so true is this that one Roman Catholic writer urges this as a recommendation of his Church.

Mivart—See his "Contemporary Evolution."

The fact that one, who is acquainted with the history of the race, can see in a Catholic Church, rites and ceremonies extending back to thousands of years before Christ, is a proof to him that the Catholic Church is more adapted to humanity than the Protestant.

But this doctrine has not only been a vital one, in showing us how religious systems have come into being. It has brought home to us this fact, that no religious system has been necessary for the growth of humanity. In systems other than Christianity the highest moral precepts are found, and I do not think the practice has been much worse. In Christianity we admire the following precepts:—

- Honour our parents.
- Do unto others as we would that they should do to us.
- Have charity.
- Blessed are the pure in heart.
- Blessed are the merciful.
- Love one another.

What do these I have mentioned, and the most of what are called the Mosaic Commandments, do but inculcate right action. Their vitality consists not in their inculcation of religious duties, but they live because they teach right conduct. There is not much of what is called religion in them, but they tend to elevate humanity. Let me read to you some from other religious systems, and I think you will find, that the good, in the Christian system, does not differ much from the good in other systems, older far than Christianity.

In the fifth Egyptian Dynasty, about 4000 years before Christ, and at least 1500 years before the Exodus, and before the Ten Commandments, there was written in Egypt a moral treatise inculcating justice, kindness, and truth. And amongst the ancient Accadians—the earliest population of Babylonia—kindness to parents, and the need of parents treating their children well, were taught. One decision given by them was as follows; it is found on a tablet.—A father says to his son, "Thou art not my son; in house and brick building they imprison him." Perhaps this is what we should do to those who desert their families. Let me quote to you a few Egyptian precepts:—"Make not a companion of a wicked man. Do not save thy life at the cost of another. Do not pervert the heart of thy acquaintances." And if you read the Hymn to Amen and to Pharaoh, written in the xix. Dynasty when the Exodus occurred, you will find similar phrases to those in the Bible. 640, B.C., Thales said, "That which then blamest in another do it not thyself." Zoroaster said, "Do as you would be done by." Confucius, "True politeness consists in never treating others as you would not like to be treated by them;" and Mencius uttered similar maxims. All religious systems have some good moral precepts. Before society can exist there must be some order, some law, some morality. As Emerson finely says, "Corn won't grow without protection," Out of humanity the religions have come, arid when a man has begun to get a religion, he has raised himself some height in the intellectual scale. He has had doubts, And he has begun to try and satisfy them. But what I submit is this, that the tendency of religion is to cramp humanity—to make it look back, and not forward, and but for the Freethinkers there would be no progress, and no hope of the future. The world is yet young—

*"For while a youth is lost in soaring thought,
And while a maid grows sweet and beautiful,
And while a spring-tide coming lights the earth,
And while a child, and while a flower is born,
And while one wrong cries for redress and finds
A soul to answer, still the world is young."*

And the future will have a better morality, and a better religion, just as our mode of travelling transcends that of the ancient Maori, and our steamship that of the Phœnician craft.

I have shown you how religion has ever waged a war against science. But, that it cramps humanity in another way, I might point out. Whoever read the history of Christianity without a shudder? Go to some

museum, and see the instruments of torture that one sect used against the other. Read the account of the crusaders, and study the history of their wars, of their massacres, directly the result of their religion, and will you not agree with me that its tendency has been to degrade humanity by restricting all intellectual freedom? Let me go back to the beginning of the eighteenth century, or rather the end of the seventeenth. I select this date because what I am going to relate took place after some statutes, we think in force in New Zealand—for example, the Sabbath statute—were passed. What is the scene? Between Edinburgh and Leith and not yet 200 years ago, in 1695, there is a gallows erected. Around it there are several Presbyterian clergymen. At the foot of the gallows, ready to be hurled from this earth, there is a youth—18 years of age. He has been a student at the university, has approached philosophical questions, dabbled in metaphysics, and as a result has doubted. He cannot understand the doctrine of the Trinity, He says men might as well speak of a square circle. This youth had committed no other crime save that of thinking—of doubting. He believed in God, believed in a future state, but he thought Ezra wrote the Pentateuch, and that Moses had learned the ancient Egyptian mythology and magic, and this youth was condemned to death. He said in prison he recanted his errors, but that did not obtain his pardon. He then asked for time to prepare to die, but this request even was not granted him. Ministers preached from their pulpits demanding his death. And this is not yet 200 years ago! And now, in the Southern Edinburgh, we can meet and speak of things for uttering which poor Thomas Aikenhead was murdered. Has not intelligence grown? Could I give a better illustration of how religion approaches the problems of existence, and how Freethought deals with them?

In his next lecture, on the benefits of Christianity, I hope the lecturer, whoever he is, will read the record of what took place in Edinburgh from the year 1690 to 1700. Do not think Aikenhead's case was an isolated one. No doubt it was isolated so far as the end of the seventeenth century was concerned, but it was a necessary consequence of the assumption that the Record of Truth had closed. The Church has ever said, "Let all heretics for ever hold their peace; if any one entertains an opinion which the Church has condemned, let him keep it to himself, and not communicate it to another." The Freethinker says the very opposite: If you have a thought, out with it. It is better that you should speak your mind than net the hypocrite. The world is not hurt much by a bad opinion. Crushing out thought that was not in accordance with the popular views has done more harm than allowing the free expression of opinion. As Mill says in "Liberty," the opinion may be true. "Those who desire to suppress it, of course deny its truth, but they are not infallible." No doctrine is so certain that it cannot be questioned. If the person who denies is correct, humanity loses by not having the error exposed. And if the denier is wrong, what harm is done by his ventilating his opinions. At one time it was a crime to assert the earth was round, and revolved round the sun. Almost everyone now believes the earth is round. There are, however, a very few people who, believing the Bible cannot be wrong, say the earth is flat. What harm is done by their ventilating their opinion? I mention this as a case where most people would say it is certain the earth is round. But what of the vast number of questions on which there is no certainty, nor any approach to certainty? Is there to be no more thinking about them? Have men in the past—well meaning, no doubt, but perhaps not acquainted with nature, as we are, going to determine for us the problems of existence? Are we to be bound by what men in Asia and Southern Europe wrote centuries ago? Yes, wrote at a time when their views of astronomy, of geology, of biology were false, erroneous—might I add—to us, even ridiculous. Is it any recommendation to the writers of ancient books that they knew nothing of science? I ask, Is their ignorance of science, which means ignorance of the world in which they were living, any evidence they knew of another world, or how the present world attained to its present development? One would think that the more ignorant of science, of nature, you proved a man who wrote on the problems of life, of the universe, the less you would value his writings. But there are some who gravely tell us that we are to take as our guides to religion, to philosophy—men who were ignorant of things taught in our district schools. As Free-thinkers, we cannot be bound by any such authority; we must bring things, ancient and modern, to the test of scientific proof. Faith has no place with us. We may have this faith, it is true:—That the world is so constituted that truth is good, error bad, and that a belief in something that is not fact can help no one. But before we believe, and base our action on belief, we must have some evidence. And here I might point out what may be termed some ways in which we are to approach historical facts, and how we are to decide on the credibility of things told us. For fuller treatment of this question, I must refer you to "Bain's Logic."

Vol. ii., p. 149 and p. 423.

first, there are some things that require more evidence than others. This, some people, who argue in favour of popular theology, often forget. For example, if one tells us that he saw a man drop down dead in Princes-street, we ask who he was, was the informant present, and if we learn our informant was there, it does not seem to us incredible. We know that men have dropped down dead, and hence the fact is not contrary to our experience. It is credible. But if the informant build us that he was in the Southern Cemetery, and saw a grave open of itself, and a body get out and live and walk about and talk—a body that had been dead for years may be—what would we say? Would the evidence that satisfied us as to the first event satisfy us as to the second? I

think not. We would say it was incredibly and we would at once say we do not believe, and we would think our informant was mad. Why? Because from past experience we know this does not occur. It is more credible that our informant was mistaken than that something opposed to all the experience of humanity should have occurred. It is inconsistent with what has hitherto been observed. And so with the relation of events, If they are opposed to some law—which means observed phenomena always occurring in like circumstances—we at once pronounce them untrue. If it is said, and this is Bain's illustration, Mahomet's coffin hung suspended in mid air, we are bound to disbelieve it, unless we can show it was kept up by magnets or other contrivances. It is contrary to the law of gravity, and if we believed in the coffin hanging, we would have to say that there is no law of gravity. So if we believe in what is called the resurrection of men from death to life again, one of our commonest inductions—one that is used as an illustration in our text books of logic—all men are mortal, would not be true. Then, if there are things told us as new—such as, it is said, clairvoyance or prophecy, etc, These cannot be believed, unless under the most rigorous tests. Why? Because they are not in accordance with the experience of the race.

Then, it may be that there are things for which there is some evidence and some against. What are we to do then? We are to consider the probabilities. But if there is no evidence for or against an assertion, we must hold it to be untrue. The illustration given in "Bain's Logic" is this: Suppose some one says the centre of the earth is occupied by gold. We can have no evidence for or against it. What are we to do? We must treat it as if it were a falsehood. It is not to be believed, nor acted on. I do not require to ask you how many things are presented for our belief for which there is no evidence, neither for nor against. Let each present just think for a moment of the number.

And how are we to treat historical records? If a man presents us with a statement of what occurred, we ask, Was he present? If he was not present, Who told him? If he did not live in the age when the event is said to have occurred, then how did he hear of it? For example: Suppose it were granted Moses wrote Genesis. He is detailing events that happened before he was born. How does he know they were true? We do not know how he obtained his information of what, for example, took place a million of years before man lived on the earth. If he says—which, by the bye, he does not—that it was told him by Deity, we enquire, When? Is there any reply? None. But if he said he was compelled to write as he wrote, and he felt it was God that told him to do so, how is this verifiable? Is there any evidence for it? Would Moses's statement be enough? We must say no, because we are cognisant of states of mankind when men imagine things just the same. Go to a Lunatic Asylum, and you will hear patients say spirits speak to them, and they say they feel things that other and sane people cannot feel. They are honest in what they say, but they are not in a normal state. Are we to believe all a person says because he feels it, and honestly tells us what he feels? No; we must verify it. Is it true? Mahomet said he was inspired; he may have believed it! Are we, then, to accept his statement? It is against experience, and we are bound to reject it. But if the writer relates events, they may be true; he may have heard of them from his contemporaries, and we know the story of things that have happened are handed down by oral tradition. Songs hundreds of years old, stories centuries old, and never written, may have been heard in out-of-the-way places, where writing and printing were rare. And if it is found, that on Assyrian and other monuments, there are histories or records telling a similar story to what the author or authors of Genesis wrote, then we would feel at liberty to conclude that these stories were the current rumours and tales of the day when the writers lived. Every Assyrian tablet that corroborates Genesis destroys any pretence of it being a divine book. But this by the way.

In viewing past events, we have two sources of evidence.

See "Bain's Logic," p.423.

We have old monuments, old books, old coins, old ruins, everything that time has not destroyed. And we may have in the old books the statements of witnesses. On this question we will have to make two enquiries: (1) Where is the witnesses' statement recorded; and (2), is it true? Is it hearsay? Is it, "Somebody told me as (somebody said that somebody else had somewhere read?" as the old ballad says, or is it the written statement of the witness himself? I need not tell you, that we are asked to believe the occurrence of many events, on the testimony of witnesses whose statements, we do not have. Then, is it true? Does it contradict observed phenomena? If it does, we need that the evidence should be rigorously examined, and we require the events to have happened, to use a spiritualistic phrase, under test conditions. Is this forthcoming? I leave you to reply. Then, moreover, we must know the character of the witnesses and their beliefs, for they may have been unconsciously biassed. For example: If we knew a man who believed, that by magic, a devil could be cast out of a man, and that epilepsy was not a disease; but that a man who had epilepsy was possessed with a devil, would his evidence on lunacy be of any avail? Then, again, if we knew a man who believed that dead bodies were often raised to life, would his evidence to prove that one was raised to life be of much value? "The eye sees that which the eye is prepared to see," says a philosopher. Let us apply this even to every-day life. Suppose a witness, being examined in one of our Courts, stating the earth was flat, and that there were witches, and that devils possessed men, for he knew it; and that there had been seven in him once, but they had been driven out,

and that he saw spirits in the sky, what would the presiding Judge say? I venture to assert he would call the police to send for two doctors to examine his mental state. If, then, we find persons with these beliefs being called by historians as witnesses to wonderful events, we must discredit their testimony. Their bias—unconscious, it may be—prevents them from being treated as credible and reliable witnesses. If, then, it be asked, how we, as Freethinkers, treat the relation of extraordinary occurrences, we must reply that we must examine them according to the canons of scientific induction. Faith has no place with us; we must have proof. And, again, I repeat, we are analysts—sifting everything, testing everything. It may be said that there are Freethinkers who have not had the requisite training nor education to take up this position. It seems to me, that a man who doubts has some education. Give me a man who never doubts, and never has doubted, and another who doubts. Take them from the same trade, the same social surroundings, and the chances are 500 to 1 that the one who doubts has more education than his fellow who never doubted. But it seems to me that a man, whatever his education, should, to the beliefs of the age, take up this position: I want proof, I want evidence. And does it require great education to weigh evidence, to test probabilities? For our jurymen, there is no educational test. And if a man cannot judge of the truth or falsity of, say, the popular creeds, what should be his position? I take it he cannot be called upon to believe what he cannot understand. But I may further reply that one who becomes a Freethinker, becomes a person who strives to understand the *pros* and *cons* of the popular creeds. This of itself is an education, and surely a higher intellectual position than that of the man who says: I have not the education nor the time to examine whether the popular creed, or my father's creed, is true or false; many men—learned and good men—have believed, and still believe it, and hence I believe. There cannot be much hope of intellectual advancement for such a one.

And, now, I come to the last point which I can deal with tonight. There are some who, unable to meet us on a logical standing-ground, ask the question as to the result of Freethought on morality. There are many things that might be said in answer to such; let me set before you a few. First, I reply, Look at the past. Look what fettered thought has done. Think of the millions slaughtered for heresy. Think how the growth of the race has been prevented. Think how science was kept back, and how truth was crushed. In the past those persons who acted thus were not Freethinkers; they were Christians; they were believers in Deity. Even the Sea Green Incorruptible got the Revolutionary Convention in Paris to decree a State religion, and the feast of the Supreme Being. He would have exiled all Atheists—at Agnostics. He thought there were two dogmas necessary for a State—Theism and the Future Life. When people talk of Freethinkers persecuting in the French Revolution, let them think of Thomas Paine in prison, and the Sea Green Incorruptible—Robespierre—demanding the exile of Atheists.

Then consider how much of the means of mankind, their mental labour, their material wealth, have been expended to propagate the dogmas of the Churches. Do you think if the same energy had been expended on science—all kinds of science—that the race would not have been further advanced? Then I pass on to another consideration—and it is this: We say the race could not exist without morality, and we say that the race will keep those laws that are self-preserving laws. I ask, What is the basis of morality? The Jews were, I suppose, moral before the meeting at Sinai, at which Moses read them the Ten Commandments. Was there no morality in Egypt? Was there none in India, none in China? Nay, before a European visited New Zealand, was there no morality amongst the Maoris? What does morality mean? I suppose it implies some recognition of rights. No people could live if all were liars, all dishonest, all thieves, Long before Sinai men lived, and loved, and did kind deeds. Do you think there was no friendship before the days of Moses? Do you think no man helped a mate when, as we say, he was down on his luck—hard up—with, perhaps, no coin and no food? Is anyone so credulous as to believe, that morality started when Moses read the words from the slate? We can go back to ancient Egyptian writings, and we can find sentiments pure and philanthropic, and not unlike the maxims we now inculcate. No, morality is not a creation of a religion; it is growth of humanity, and as mankind has advanced in knowledge it has become elevated. Let us place our basis of morality here, and nothing can disturb it.

"If," says a writer,

"Data of Ethics," by Herbert Spencer, page 50.

"there are no other origins for right and wrong than an enunciated or intuited divine will, then, as alleged, were there no knowledge of the divine will, the acts now known as wrong would not be known as wrong. But if men did not know such acts to be wrong because contrary to the divine will, and so in committing them, did not offend by disobedience; and if they could not otherwise know them to be wrong; then they might commit them indifferently with the acts now classed as right; the results practically considered would be the same. In so far as secular matters are concerned, there would be no difference between the two, for to say that in the affairs of life any evils would arise from continuing to do the acts called wrong, and ceasing to do the acts called right, is to say that these produce in themselves certain mischievous consequences, and certain beneficial consequences; which is to say there is another source for moral rules than the revealed or inferred divine will;

they may be established by induction from these inferred consequences. From this implication I see no escape. It must be either admitted or denied that the acts called good and the acts called bad naturally conduce, the one to human well-being, and the other to human ill-being. Is it admitted? Then the admission amounts to an assertion that the conduciveness is shown by experience; and this involves abandonment of the doctrine that there is no origin for morals apart from divine injunctions. Is it denied, that acts classed as good and bad differ in their effects? Then it is tacitly affirmed that human affairs would go on just as well in ignorance of the distinction; and the alleged need for commandments from God disappear."

But not only would morality be placed on a surer and firmer basis, were it recognised that the goodness or badness of an action, does not depend on any commandment, but on its effect on the race, but true morality would be promoted. If the individual is injured, the race is injured. In the growth of the race the individual must not, nay, cannot be overlooked. And then, consider some things Freethinkers are ever exalting. Truth above all things. Authority, dogma, Church organisation, respectability, all must yield to truth. Can we insist too much on this? Suppose there were no lies in the world, would it not be a happier and a better world? Is it immoral teaching to place truth in the fore front? This is what we do. And yet because we prefer truth to authority, truth to faith, truth to Church dogmas, our teaching is immoral!!

And, then, there is another thing we teach. It is that bad actions have had consequences. If something is done to cripple a tree, to prevent its liberty, its growth, we get a stunted tree. So with a man. Give him bad surroundings, give him no education, do you think you will get a good man? If a man does wrong, he has suffered. Even the physical appearance of a man is changed if he neglects right doing. And, I ask you, Which teaching is more likely to tend to good actions, to right doing, that which tells a man if he does wrong he suffers punishment, or that which is ever telling him of a mode of escape through the death of a God? Tell a man that, a few minutes before his death, all his bad deeds can be blotted out, by a profession of belief, and will he feel so uncomfortable as if he were told: "There is no atonement for you, and none for your children. They also may suffer for your actions," I believe were the law of heredity firmly grasped, no more potent preacher could ever be found to make men moral. A bad habit may extend its influence to many generations. Given drunken, criminal parents, the chances are that the children will inherit some of the vices of their ancestors. Physically the child inherits its parent: peculiarities, so mentally, so morally. Let this truth be firmly grasped, and I think it will tend more to morality than the popular views about the Atonement. There seems to me no doctrine or hypothesis so moral, so tending to induce men to aim at physical, mental, and moral perfection, as Evolution. From your physical neglect, no escape; from your mental torpor, no escape; from your wrong doing, no escape. And yet, because we proclaim this, and deny the popular belief about imputed righteousness, and sin, and atonement, our teaching lends to immorality!

We live in hopes of material advances. We are ever hoping for an improvement of the race. New discoveries, new inventions, new laws of nature, we ever welcome. They cannot disturb us. We have no old dogmas that they can shatter. We also look for the further development of the race. The race did not cease to be inspired 2000 years ago, did not cease to progress in morality, for,

*Still the heavens lie open as of old
To the entranced gaze, ay nearer far,
And brighter than of yore; and Might is there,
And Infinite Purity is there, and high
Eternal Wisdom, and the calm, clear face
Of duty."*

If the race has done high, noble, heroic things in the past, it will transcend them in the future. We will have a better religion, a nobler government, a truer morality, a mightier science than the world has yet seen.

What is our attitude, then, to the existing religions? To those who profess them we have no antipathy, no desire to persecute them. Liberty is ever our watchword. We examine the religions of the past just as we examine the habits of an existing animal, or read the records of the fossil life of the planet. Since the science of comparative religion has been established, we have seen that granted a certain development we may expect a certain religious and a certain political system. And we have learned what many Freethinkers of the last century did not appreciate, that religion is not a creation of priests, but a growth of humanity. It has its growth, its decay. And we may, using the words of John Morley, say to the Churches;

"We shall pass you by on your flank; your fiercest darts will only spend themselves on air. We will not attack you as Voltaire did; we will not exterminate you; we shall explain you. History will place your dogma in its class, above or below a hundred competing dogmas, exactly as the naturalist classifies his species. From being a conviction, it will sink to a curiosity; from being the guide to millions of human lives, it will dwindle

down to a chapter in a book. As history explains your dogma, so science will dry it up; the conception of law will silently make the conception of the daily miracle of your altars seem impossible; the mental climate will gradually deprive your symbols of their nourishment, and men will turn their backs on your system, not because they have confuted it, but because, like witchcraft or astrology, it has ceased to interest them."

In the time at my command, I have, I think, helped you to understand our position.

The relation of Freethought to science and to other things, I have not time to dwell on. To those who say our organisation is unnecessary, let me address a few words. We know there is in all Churches a spirit of inquiry abroad. There are numerous adherents, and Church members, who do not believe the creeds, numerous members who hesitate to repeat what one Church orders its clergy and members to repeat—that those who do not believe certain doctrines shall suffer eternal damnation. We admit this, But, we say, that it is better a man should freely express his views, than lend his countenance and support to a system he thinks wrong. A harsh term might be used to characterise such conduct, but I shall not use it, as I feel sure many remain in Churches after they have ceased to be to them living institutions, unconscious of their doing aught wrong. There are others who do so out of respect to the belief of their relations, and so as not to hurt their feelings. Do not judge them. Let us each act up to what we believe, and whilst we do so, we expect that we shall have the fullest liberty in the State. And here comes in, why we organise. Without some kind of organisation we are liable to be politically ignored. Even since we met to lay the foundation stone of our hall, what have we seen? A deputation of leading citizens asking the aid of the law to put down our lectures. Have we not, then, need of organisation, of united action? Alas! the enemies of freedom, of liberty, of thought, have not yet ceased to be. They are ever active, ever watchful. Time and again in past history, have they been successful. Truth has been often crushed, often conquered. But, happily for the good of humanity, in some souls there sprang up the desire to know, stronger than the desire to believe, and again the battle between truth and falsehood was fought, and error was vanquished. But we must watch. We are in a minority, and we are trained by our political system to assume that majorities must rule. So it must be. But there is something that transcends even the rights of majorities; it is the right of man to think, and to speak what he thinks.—Let us ever guard that sacredly, so that when we are gone our children, and may be our children's children, will have privileges that even humanity does not now possess. Let us, at all events, see that if we can help it, what we enjoy in Dunedin in 1882 shall never be lessened, never curtailed, and that no one will ever be able to point to our time with a shudder, as we point to the age when Thomas Aikenhead was murdered.

"O Freedom! Thou art not a poet's dream,
A fair young girl, with light and delicate limbs,
And wavy tresses gushing from the cap
With which the Roman master crowned his slave,
When he took off the gyves. A bearded man,
Armed to the teeth, art thou; one mailed hand
Grasps the broad shield, and one the sword; thy brow,
Glorious is beauty tho' it be, is scarred
With tokens of old wars; thy massive limbs
Are strong with struggling.
. . . Tyranny himself,
Thy enemy, although of reverend look,
Hoary with many years, and far obeyed,
Is later born than thou; and as he meets
The grave defiance of thine elder eye,
Thou shalt wax stronger with the lapse of years,
But he shall fade into a feebler age—
Feebler, yet subtler. He shall weave his snares,
And spring them on thy careless steps, and clap
His withered hands, and from their ambush call
His hordes to fall upon their. He shall send
Quaint maskers, wearing fair and gallant forms
To catch thy gaze, and uttering graceful words
To charm thy ear; while his sly imps by stealth
Twine round thee threads of steel, light thread on thread
That grows to fetters—or bind down thy arms

With chains contained in chaplets. Oh, not yet
May'st thou embrace thy corslet, nor lay by
Thy sword. Not yet, O Freedom I close thy lides
On slumber; for thine enemy never sleeps,
And thou must watch and combat till the day
Of the new earth and heaven!"

The Religion of the Future. Eleventh Edition.] A Discourse DELIVERED TO IMMENSE AUDIENCES IN AMERICA, BY Colonel Ingersoll

Colonel Ingersoll,

The celebrated American Orator and Wit.

Price Twopence. W. H. Morrish, Bookseller, 18, Narrow Wine Street, Bristol; Freethought Publishing Company, 28, Stonecutter-St, London; Truelove, 256. High Holborn, London; Cattell & Co., 84, Fleet Street, London; The Bookstall, 75, Humberstone Gate, Leicester; Witty, Bookseller, Hull. Wheeler, King, & Co., Edinburgh.

REV. Henry Ward Beecher says

:—"I admire Ingersoll he is not afraid to speak what he honestly thinks and I am only sorry he does not think as I do. I never heard so much brilliancy and pith put into a two hours Speech as I did on that night. I with my whole Congregation had been there to hear it. I regard him as one of the greatest Men of the Age."—New York Herald.

[THE following Lecture was delivered in New York to an overflowing assemblage. COLONEL INGERSOLL enchaind the attention of the audience and frequently received a spontaneous burst of applause.

Earnest,—impassioned,—startling,—and humorous by turns,—at the conclusion of the lecture he received quite an ovation, and was compelled to appear again and bow his acknowledgments. A similar fate seems to await him in England; those who have read any of his speeches need not be reminded of the raciness and shrewdness that characterise his remarks.]

IN the republic of mind, *one* is a majority. There, all are monarchs and all are equals. The tyranny of a majority even is unknown Each one is crowned, sceptered, and throned. Upon every brow is the tiara, and around every form is the imperial purple. Only those are good citizens who express their honest thoughts, and those who persecute for opinion's sake are the only traitors. There, nothing is considered infamous except an appeal to brute force, and nothing sacred but love, liberty, and joy. The church contemplates this republic with a sneer. From the teeth of hatred she draws back the lips of scorn. She is filled with the spite and spleen born of intellectual weakness. Once she was egotistic; now she is envious. Once she wore upon her hollow breast false gems, supposing them to be real. They have been shown to be false, but she wears them still. She has the malice of the caught, the hatred of the exposed.

We are told to investigate the bible for ourselves, and at the same time informed that if we come to the conclusion that it is not the word of God, we will most assuredly be damned. Under such circumstances, if we believe this, investigation is impossible. Whoever is held responsible for his conclusions cannot weigh the evidence with impartial scales. Fear stands at the balance, and gives to falshood the weight or its trembling hand.

It seems almost impossible for religious people to really grasp the idea of intellectual freedom. They seem to think that man is responsible for his honest thoughts; that unbelief is a crime; that investigation is sinful; that credulity is a virtue, and that reason is a dangerous guide. They cannot divest themselves of the idea that obedience—laws and penalties—rewards and punishments, and that somewhere in the universe there is a penitentiary for the soul.

In the history of our poor world, no horror has been omitted, no infamy has been left undone by the believers in the supernatural, by the worshippers of these fleshly phantoms. And yet these shadows were born of cowardice and malignity. They were painted by the pencil of fear upon the canvas of ignorance by that artist called superstition.

Fear paralyzes the brain. Progress is born of courage. Fear believes—courage doubts. Fear fall a upon the earth and prays—courage stands erect and thinks. Fear retreats—courage advances. Fear is barbarism—courage is civilization. Fear believes in witchcraft, in devils and in ghosts. Fear is religion—courage is science.

For ages these ghosts were supposed to be the only source of real knowledge. They inspired men to write

books, and the books were considered sacred. If facts were found to be inconsistent with these books, so much the worse for the facts, and especially for their discoverers. It was then, and still is, believed that these books are the basis of the idea of immortality; that to give up these volumes, or rather the idea that they are inspired, is to renounce the idea of immortality. This I deny.

The idea of immortality, that like a sea has ebbed and flowed in the human breast with its countless waves of hope and fear, beating against the shores and rocks of time and fate, was not born of any book, nor of any creed, nor of any religion. It was born of human affection, and it will continue to ebb and flow beneath the mists and clouds of doubt and darkness as long as love kisses the lips of death. It is the rainbow—Hope shining upon the tears of grief.

From the books written by the priests we have at last ascertained that they knew nothing about the world in which we live. Did they know anything about the next? Upon every point where contradiction is possible, they have been contradicted.

Slowly but surely man is freeing his imagination of these sexless phantoms, of these cruel ghosts. Slowly but surely he is rising above the superstition of the past. He is learning to rely upon himself. He is beginning to find that labor is the only prayer that ought to be answered, and that hoping, toiling, aspiring, suffering men and women are of more importance than all the ghosts that ever wandered through the fenceless fields of space.

Our fathers in the good old times—and the best thing I can say of them is that they have passed away—had an idea that they could force men to think their way. Even in our day some extremely religious people say, "We will not trade with that man; we will not vote for him; we will not hire him if he is a lawyer; we will die before we will take his medicine if he is a doctor; we will not invite him to dinner; we will socially ostracise him; he must come to our church; he must believe in our doctrine; he must worship our god or we will not in any way contribute to his support.

In the old times of which I have spoken, they desired to make all men think exactly alike. All the mechanical ingenuity of the world cannot make two clocks run exactly alike, and how are you going to make hundreds of millions of people differing in brain and disposition, in education and aspiration, in conditions and surroundings, each clad in a living robe of passionate flesh—how are you going to make them think and feel alike? If there is an infinite God, one who made us, mid wishes us to think alike, why did he give a spoonful of brains to one, and a magnificent intellectual development to another? Why is it that we have all degrees of intelligence, from orthodoxy to genius, if it was intended that all should think and feel alike?

I used to read in books how our fathers persecuted mankind. But I never appreciated it. I read it, but it did not burn itself into my soul. I did not really appreciate the infamies that have been committed in the name of religion, until I saw the iron thumb-screw—two little pieces of iron, armed on the inner surfaces with protuberances, to prevent their slipping; through each end a screw uniting the two pieces. And when some man denied the efficacy of baptism, or maybe said, "I do not believe that a fish ever swallowed a man to keep him from drowning," then they put his thumb between these pieces of iron and in the name of love and universal forgiveness, began to screw these pieces together. When this was done most men said, "I will recant." Probably I should have done the same. Probably I would have said "Stop, I will admit anything that you wish, I will admit that there is one God or a million, one hell or a billion; suit yourselves, but stop that"

But there was now and then a man that would not swerve the breadth of a hair. There was now and then some sublime heart willing to die for an intellectual conviction, Had it not been for such men, we should be savages to night. Had it not been for a few brave heroic souls in every age, we would have been cannibals, with pictures of wild beasts tattooed upon our flesh, dancing around some dried snake fetish.

Let us thank every good and noble man who stood so grandly, so proudly, in spite of opposition, of hatred and death, for what he believed to be the truth.

Heroism did not excite the respect of our fathers. The man who would not recant was not forgiven. They screwed the thumb-screw down to the last pang, and then threw their victim into some dungeon, where, in the throbbing silence and darkness, he might suffer the agonies of the fabled damned. This was done in the name of love—in the name of mercy—in the name of the compassionate Christ.

I saw, too, what they called the Collar of Torture. Imagine a circle of iron, and on the inside a hundred points almost as sharp as needles. This argument was fastened about the throat of the sufferer. Then he could not walk, nor sit down, nor stir without the neck being punctured by these points. In a little while the throat would begin to swell, and suffocation would end the agonies of that man. This man, it may be, had committed the crime of saying, with tears upon his cheeks, "I do not believe that God, the father of us all, will damn to eternal perdition any of the children of men.

I saw another instrument called the Scavenger's Daughter. Think of a pair of shears with handles, not only where they now are but at the points as well, and just above the pivot that unites the blades, a circle of iron. In the upper handles the hands would be placed; in the lower the feet, and through the iron ring at the centre the head of the victim would be forced. In this condition he would be thrown prone upon the earth, and the strain

upon the muscles produced such agony that insanity would in pity end his pain.

This was done by gentlemen who said, "Whosoever smiteth thee upon one cheek turn to him the other also."

I saw the Rack. This was a box like the bed of a wagon, with a windlass at each end, with, levers, and ratchets to prevent slipping; over each windlass went chains; some were fastened to the ankles of the sufferer; others to the wrists. And then priests, clergymen, divines, saints, began turning, until the ankles, the knees, the hips, the shoulders, the elbows, the wrists of the victim were all dislocated, and the sufferer was wet with the sweat of agony. And they had a physician standing by to feel his pulse. What for? To save his life? Yes! In mercy. No; simply that they might rack him once again.

This was done, remember, in the name of civilization; in the name of law and order; in the name of mercy; in the name of religion; in the name of the most merciful Christ.

Sometimes, when I read and think about these frightful things, it seems to me that I have suffered all these horrors myself. It seems sometimes, as though I had stood upon the shore of exile and gazed with tearful eyes towards home and native land; as though my nails had been torn from my hands, and into the bleeding quick needles had been thrust: as though my feet had been crushed by iron boots; as though I had been chained in the cell of the Inquisition and listened with dying ears for the coining footsteps of release; as though I had stood upon the scaffold and had seen the glittering axe fall upon me, as though I had been upon the rack and had seen, bending above me, the white faces of hypocrite priests; as though I had been taken from my fireside, from my wife and children, taken to the public square, chained; as though faggots had been piled about me; as though the flames had climbed around my limbs and scorched my eyes to blindness and as though my ashes had been scattered to the four winds, by all the countless hands of hate. And when I so feel, I swear that while I live I will do what little I can to preserve and augment the liberties of man woman, and child.

It is a question of justice, of mercy, of honesty, of intellectual development. If there is a man in the world who is not willing to give to every human being every right he claims for himself, he is just so much nearer a barbarian than I am. It is a question of honesty. The man who is not willing to give to every other the same intellectual rights he claims for himself, is dishonest, selfish, and brutal.

A little while ago I saw models of nearly everything that man has made. I saw models of all the water craft, from the rude dug-out in which floated a naked savage—one of our ancestors—a naked savage, with teeth two inches in length, with a spoonful of brains at the back of his head—I saw models of all the water craft of the world, from that dug-out up to a man-of-war, that carries a hundred guns and miles of canvas—from that dug-out to the steamship that turns its brave prow from the port of New York, with a compass like a conscience, crossing three thousand miles of billows without missing a throb or beat of its mighty iron heart.

I saw at the same time the weapons that man had made, from in a club, such as was grasped by that same savage, when he crawled from his den in the ground and hunted a snake for his dinner; from that club to the boomerang, to the sword, to the crossbow, to the blunderbuss, to the flint-lock, to the cap-lock, to the needle gun, up to a cannon cast by Krupp, capable of hurling a ball weighing two thousand pounds through eighteen inches of solid steel.

I saw too, the armour from the shell of a turtle, that one of our brave ancestors lashed upon, his breast when he went to fight for his country; the skin of a porcupine, dried with the quills on, which this same savage pulled over his orthodox head, up to the shirts of mail, that were worn in the Middle Ages, that laughed at the edge of a sword and defied the point of a spear; up to a monitor clad in complete steel.

I saw at the same time, their musical instruments, from the tom-tom—that is, a hoop with a couple of strings of raw hide drawn across it—from that tom-tom, up to the instruments we have to-day, that make the common air blossom with melody.

I saw, too, their paintings, from a daub of yellow mud, to the great works which now adorn the galleries of the world. I saw also their sculpture, from the rude god with four legs, a half-dozen arms, several noses, and too or three rows of ears, and one little, contemptible, brainless head, up to the figures of to-day—to the marbles that genius has clad in such a personality that it seems almost impudent to touch them without an introduction.

I saw their books, books written upon skins of wild beasts—upon shoulder blades of sheep—books written upon leaves, upon bark, up to the splendid volumes that enrich the libraries of our day. When I speak of libraries I think of the remark of Plato: "A house that has a library in it has a soul."

I saw their implements of agriculture, from a crooked stick that was attached to the horn of an ox by some twisted straw, to the agricultural implements of this generation, that make it possible for a man to cultivate the soil without being an ignoramus.

While looking upon these things I was forced to say that man advanced only as he mingled his thoughts with his labor—only as he got into partnership with the forces of nature—only as he learned to take advantage of his surroundings—only as he freed himself from the bondage of fear—only as he depended upon himself—only as he lost confidence in the gods.

I saw at the same time a row of human skulls, from the lowest skull that has been found, the Neanderthal skull—skulls from Central Africa, skulls from the Bushmen of Australia—skulls from the farthest isles of the Pacific Sea—up to the best skulls of the last generation;—and I noticed that there was the same difference between those skulls that there was between the *products* of those skulls, and I said to myself, "After all, it is a simple question of intellectual development." There was the same difference between those skulls the lowest and highest skulls, that there was between the dug-out and the steamship, between the club and the Krupp gun, between the yellow daub and the landscape, between the tom-tom and an opera by Verdi.

The first and lowest skull in this row was the den in which crawled the base and meaner instincts of mankind, and the last was a temple in which dwelt joy, liberty and love.

It is all a question of brain, of intellectual development. If we are nearer free than were our fathers, it is because we have better heads upon the average, and more brains in them.

Now, I ask you to be honest with me. It makes no difference to you what I believe, nor what I wish to prove. I simply ask you to be honest. Divest your minds for a moment at least of all religious prejudices. Act, for a moment as though you were men and women.

Suppose the king, if there was one, and the priest, if there was one, at the time this gentleman floated in his dug-out, and charmed his cars with the music of the tom-tom, had said: "That dug-out is the best boat that ever can be built by man; the pattern of that came from on high, from the great god of storm and flood, and any man who says that he can improve it by putting a mast in it, with a sail upon it, is an infidel, and shall be burned at the stake," what in your judgment—honor bright—would have been the effect upon the circumnavigation of the globe.

Suppose the king, if there was one, and the priest, if there was one—and I presume there was a priest, for it was a very ignorant ape—suppose this king and priest had said, "That tom-tom is the most beautiful instrument of music of which any man can conceive; that is the kind of music they have in heaven; an angel sitting upon the edge of a fleecy cloud, golden in the setting sun, playing upon that tom-tom, became so enraptured, so entranced with her own music, that in a kind of ecstasy she dropped it—that is how we obtained it; and any man who says it can be improved by putting a back and front to [*unclear*: it,] and four strings, and a bridge, and getting a bow of hair with rosin, is a blaspheming wretch, and shall die the death,"—I ask you, what effect would that have had upon music? If that course had been pursued, would the human ears, in your judgment, ever have been enriched with the splendid symphonies of Beethoven?

Suppose the king, if there was one, and the priest, had said, "That crooked stick is the best plough that can be invented: the pattern of that plough was given to a pious farmer in a holy dream, and that twisted straw is the *ne plus ultra* of all twisted things, and any man who says he can make an improvement, upon that plough is an atheist," what in your judgment would have been the effect upon the science of agriculture?

But the people said, and the king and priest said: "We want better weapons with which to kill our fellow christians; we want better ploughs, better music, better paintings, and whosoever will give us better weapons, and better music, better houses to live in, better clothes, we will robe him in wealth, and crown him with honor." Every incentive was held out to every human being to improve these things. That is the reason the club has been changed to a cannon, the dug-out to a steamship, the daub to a painting, that is the reason that the piece of rough and broken stone finally became a glorified statue.

You must not, however, forget that the gentleman in the dug-out, who was enraptured with the music of the tom-tom and cultivated his land with a crooked stick, had a religion of his own. The gentleman in the dug-out was orthodox. He was never troubled with doubts. He lived and died settled in his mind. He believed in hell; and he thought he would be far happier in heaven, if he could just lean over and see certain people who expressed doubts as to the truth of his creed, gently but everlastingly broiled and burned.

It is a very sad and unhappy fact that this man has had a great many intellectual descendants. It is also an unhappy fact in nature, that the ignorant multiply much faster than the intellectual. This fellow in the dug-out believed in a personal devil. His devil had a cloven hoof, a long tail armed with a fiery dart, and his devil breathed brimstone. This devil was at least the equal of God; not quite so stout but a little shrewder. And do you know there has not been a patentable improvement made upon that devil for sis; thousand years.

This gentleman in the dug-out believed that God was a tyrant; that he would eternally damn the man who lived in accordance with his highest and grandest ideal. He believed that the earth was flat. He believed in a literal, burning, seething hell of fire and sulphur. He had also his idea of politics, and his doctrine was, might makes right. And it will take thousands of years before the world will reverse this doctrine, and believingly say, "Right makes might."

All I ask is the same privilege to improve upon that gentleman's theology as upon his musical instrument; the same right to improve upon his politics as upon his dug-out. That is all. I ask for the human soul the same liberty in every direction. That is the only crime I have committed. I say, let us think. Let each one express his thought. Let us become investigators, not followers, not cringers and crawlers. If there is in heaven an infinite

being, he never will be satisfied with the worship of cowards and hypocrites. Honest unbelief, honest infidelity, honest atheism, will be a perfume in heaven when pious hypocrisy; no matter how religious it may be outwardly, will be a stench.

This is my doctrine. Give every other human being every right you claim for yourself. Keep your mind open to the influence of nature. Receive new thoughts with hospitality. Let us advance.

The religionist of to-day wants the ship of his soul to lie at the wharf of orthodoxy and rot in the sun. He delights to hear the sails of old opinions flap against the masts of old creeds. He loves to see the joints and sides open, and gape in the sun, and it is a kind of bliss for him to repeat again and again: "Do not disturb my opinions. Do not unsettle my mind, I have it all made up, and I want no infidelity. Let me go backward rather than forward.

As far as I am concerned I wish to be out on the high seas. I wish to take my chances with wind, and wave, and star. And I had rather go down in the glory and grandeur of the storm, than to rot in any orthodox harbour whatever.

After all, we are improving from age to age. The most orthodox people in this country two hundred years ago would have been burned for the crime of heresy. The ministers who denounce me to day for expressing my thoughts would have been in the Inquisition themselves. Where once burned and blazed the bivouac fires of the army of progress, now glow the altars of the church, The religionists of our time are occupying about the same ground occupied by heretics and infidels of one hundred years ago. The church has advanced in spite, as it were, of itself. It has followed the army of progress protesting and denouncing, and had to keep within protesting and denouncing distance. If the church had not made great progress I could not express my thoughts.

Man, however, has advanced just exactly in the proportion with which he has mingled his thought with his labor. The sailor, without control of the wind and wave, knowing nothing or very little of the mysterious currents and pulses of the sea, is superstitious. So also is the agriculturist, whose prosperity depends upon something he cannot control, But the mechanic, when a wheel refuses to turn, never thinks of dropping on his knees and asking the assistance of some divine power. He knows there is a reason. He knows that something is too large or too small, that there is something wrong with his machine, and he goes to work, and he makes it larger or smaller, here or there, until the wheel will turn. Now, just in proportion as man gets away from being, as it were, the slave of his surroundings the serf of the elements—of the heat, the frost, the snow, and the lightning—just to the extent that he has gotten control of his own destiny, just to the extent that he has triumphed over the obstacles of nature, he has advanced physically and intellectually. As man develops he places a greater value upon his own rights. Liberty becomes a grander and diviner thing. As he values his own rights, he begins to value the rights of others. And when all men give to all others all the rights they claim for themselves, this world will be civilized.

This world is beginning to pay homage to intellect, to genius, to heart.

We have advanced. We have reaped the benefit of every sublime and heroic self-sacrifice, of every divine and brave act; and we should endeavour to hand the torch to the next generation, having added a little to the intensity and glory of the flame.

When I think of how much this world has suffered; when I think of how long our fathers were slaves, of how they cringed and crawled at the foot of the throne, and in the dust of the altar, and how they abased themselves, of how abjectly they stood in the presence of superstition robed and crowned. I am amazed.

Nearly every religion has accounted for all the wickedness in this world by the crime of woman. What a gallant thing that is! And if it be true, I had rather live with the woman I love in a world full of trouble, than to live in heaven with nobody but men.

I read in a book—and I will say now that I cannot give the exact language, as my memory does not retain the words, but I can give the substance—I read in a book that the Supreme Being concluded to make a world and one man: that he took some nothing and made a world and one man, and put this man in a garden. In a little while he noticed that the man got lonesome; that he wandered around as if he was waiting for a train. There was nothing to interest him; no news; no papers; no policy, and, as the devil had not made his appearance, there was no chance for reconciliation, not even for civil service reform. Well, he wandered about the garden in this condition, until finally the Supreme Being made up his mind to make him a companion.

Having used up all the nothing he originally took in making the world and one man, he had to take a part of the man to start a woman with. So he caused a sleep to fall on this man—now understand me, I do not say this story is true. After the sleep fell upon this man, the Supreme Being took a rib, or as the French would call it, a cutlet out of this man, and from that he made a woman. And considering the amount of raw material used, I look upon it as the most successful job ever performed. Well, after he got the woman done, she was brought to the man; not to see how she liked him, but to see how he liked her. Well, he liked her, and they started housekeeping; and were told of certain things they might do, and one thing they must not do—and of course they did it I would have done it in fifteen minutes, and I know it. There would'nt have been an apple left on that

tree half an hour from date and the limbs would have been full of clubs. And then they were turned out of the park and extra policemen were put on to keep them from getting back.

Devilment soon commenced. The mumps, and the measles, and the whooping cough, and the scarlet fever started in their race for man. They began to have the toothache, roses began to have thorns, snakes began to have poisonous teeth, and people began to snarl and divide about religion and politics, and the world has been full of trouble from that day to this.

Nearly all of the religions of this world account for the existence of evil by such a story as that!

I read in another book what appeared to be an account of the same transaction. It was written about four thousand years before the other. All commentators agree that the one that was written last was the original, and that the one that was written first was copied from the one that was written last. But I would advise you all not to allow your creed to be disturbed by a little matter of four or five thousand years. In this other story, Brahma made up his mind to make the world and a man and woman. He made the world, and he made the man and then the woman, and put them on the island of Ceylon. According to the account it was the most beautiful island of which man can conceive. Such birds, such songs, such flowers and such verdure. And the branches of the trees were so arranged that when the wind swept through them every tree was a thousand Æolian harps.

Brahma, when he put them there, said: "Let them have a period of courtship, for it is my desire and will that true love should for ever precede marriage." When I read that it was so much more beautiful and lofty than the other, that I said to myself, "If either one of these stories ever turns out to be true I hope it will be this one."

Then they had their courtship, with the nightingale singing, and the stars shining, and the flowers blooming, and they fell in love. Imagine that courtship! No prospective fathers or mothers-in-law; no prying and gossiping neighbours; nobody to say, "Young man how do you expect to support her." Nothing of that kind. They were married by the Supreme Brahma, and he said to them: "Remain here, you must never leave this island." Well, after a little while the man—and his name was Adami, and the woman's name was Heva—said to Heva: "I believe I'll look about a little." He went to the northern extremity of the island where there was a narrow little neck of land connecting it with the mainland, and the devil, who is always playing pranks with us produced a mirage, and when he looked over to the mainland, such hills and vales, such dells and dales, such mountains crowned with snow, such cataracts clad in bows of glory did he see there, that he went back and told Heva: "The country over there is a thousand times better than this, let us migrate." She, like every other woman that ever lived, said, "Let well alone; we have all we want; let us stay here." But he said "No, let us go," so she followed him, and when they came to this narrow neck of land, he took her on his back like a gentleman and carried her over. But the moment they got over they heard a crash, and looking back, discovered that this narrow neck of land had fallen into the sea. The mirage had disappeared, and there were nought but rocks and sand; and then the Supreme Brahma cursed them both to the lowest depths of hell.

Then it was that the man spoke—and I have liked him ever since for it—"Curse me, but curse not her, it was not her fault, it was mine."

That's the kind of man to start a world with.

The Supreme Brahma said: "I will save her but not thee. And then she spoke out of her fullness of love, out of a heart in which there was love enough to make all her daughters rich in holy affection, and said: "If thou wilt not spare him, spare neither me; I do not wish to live without him; I love him." Then the Supreme Brahma said—and I have liked him ever since I read it—"I will spare you both and watch over you and your children for ever."

Honor bright, is not that the better and grander story?

In my judgement the woman is the equal of the man. She has all the rights I have and one more, and that is the right to be protected. That is my doctrine. You are married; try and make the woman you love happy. Whoever marries simply for himself will make a mistake, but whoever loves a woman so well that he says, "I will make her happy," makes no mistake. And so with the woman who says, "I will make him happy." There is only one way to be happy, and that is to make somebody else so, and you cannot be happy by going cross lots, you have got to go the regular turnpike road.

If there is any man I detest, it is the man who thinks he is the head of a family—the man who thinks he is boss."

Imagine a young man and a young woman courting, walking out in the moonlight, and the nightingale singing a song of pain and love, as though the thorn touched her heart—imagine them stopping there in the moonlight and starlight and song, and saying, "Now, here, let us settle who is 'boss!'" I tell you it is an infamous word and an infamous feeling, I abhor a man who is "boss" who is going to govern in his family, and when he speaks orders all the rest to be still as some mighty idea is about to be launched from his mouth. Do you know I dislike this man unspeakably!

I hate above all things a cross man. What right has he to murder the sunshine of a day? What right has he to assassinate the joy of life? When you go home you ought to go like a ray of light—so that it will, even in the

night burst out of the doors and windows and illuminate the darkness. Some men think their mighty brains have been in a turmoil; they have been thinking about who will be alderman from the fifth ward; they have been thinking about politics; great and mighty questions have been engaging their minds; they have bought calico at five cents or six, and want to sell it for seven. Think of the intellectual strain that must have been upon that man, and when he gets home everybody else in the house must look out for his comfort. A woman who has only taken care of five or six children, and one or two of them sick, has been nursing them and singing to them, and trying to make one yard of cloth do the work of two, she, of course, is fresh and fine to wait upon this gentleman—the head of the family—the boss!

Do you know another thing? I despise a stingy man. I have known men who would trust their wives with their hearts and their honor 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! That's the way to spend it. If it has got to go, let it go.

Get the best you can for your family—try to look as well as you can yourself. When you used to go courting, how elegantly you looked! Ah, your eye was bright, your step was light, and you looked like a prince. Do you know that it is insufferable egotism in you to suppose a woman is going to love you always looking as slovenly as you can! Think of it! Any good woman on earth will be true to you for ever when you do your level best.

Some people tell me, "Your doctrine about loving and wives, and all that, is splendid for the rich, but it won't do for the poor," I tell you to-night there is more love in the houses of the poor than in the palace of the rich. The meanest hut with love in it is a palace fit for the gods, and a palace without love is a den only fit for wild beasts. You cannot be so poor that you cannot help somebody. Good nature is the cheapest commodity in the world: and love is the only thing that will pay ten per cent. to borrower and lender both. Do not tell me you have got to be rich! We have a false standard of greatness. We think that a man must be notorious; that he must be extremely wealthy; or that his name must be upon the putrid lips of rumour. It is all a mistake, It is not necessary to be rich, or to be great, or to be powerful, to be happy. The happy man is the successful man, Joy is wealth. No matter whether you are rich or poor; treat your wife as though she were a splendid flower, and she will fill your life with perfume and with joy.

And do you know, it is a splendid thing to think that the woman you love will never grow old to you. Through the wrinkles of time, through the mask of years, if you really love her you will always see the face you loved and won. And a woman who really loves a man does not see that he grows old; he is not decrepit to her; he does not tremble; she always sees the same gallant gentleman who won her hand and heart. I like to think of it in that way; I like to think that love is eternal. And to love in that way and then go down the hill of life together, and as you go down, hear, perhaps, the laugh of grandchildren, while the birds of joy and love sing once more in the leafless branches of the tree of age.

And I tell you that the children have the same rights that we have and we ought to treat them as though they were human beings. They should be reared with love, kindness, and tenderness, and not with brutality. That is my idea of children. What shall I say of the little children in alleys and cellars; little children who turn pale when they hear their fathers footsteps; little children who run away when they only hear their names called by the lips of a mother; little children—the children of poverty, the children of crime, the children of brutality, wherever they are—flotsam and jetsam upon the wild, mad, sea of life—my heart goes out to them one and all. When one of your children tells a lie be honest with him; tell him that you have told hundreds of them yourself. Tell him, it is not the best way; that you have tried it. Tell him, as the man did in Maine when his boy left home, "John, honesty is the best policy, I have tried both," Be honest with him. Suppose a man as much larger than you as you are larger than a child five years old, should come at you with a club in his hand, and in a voice like thunder shout, "Who broke that plate?" There is not a solitary one of you who would not swear you never saw it; or that it was cracked when you got it. Why not be honest with these children? Just imagine a man who deals in stocks whipping his boy for putting false rumours afloat! Think of a lawyer beating his own flesh and blood for evading the truth, when he makes half of his own living that way! Think of a minister punishing his child for not telling all he thinks! Just think of it!

I do not believe in the government of the lash. If any one of you expects ever to whip your children again, I want you to have a photograph taken of yourself when you are in the act, with your face red with vulgar anger, and the face of the little child with eyes swimming in tears and the little chin dimpled with fear, like a piece of cold water struck with a sudden cold wind. Have the picture taken. If that little child should die, I cannot think of a sweeter way to spend an autumn afternoon than to go out to the cemetery when the maples are clad in tender gold, and little scarlet runners are coming, like poems of regret, from the sad heart of the earth—and sit

down upon the grave and look at the photograph, and think of the flesh now dust that you beat. I tell you it is wrong; it is no way to raise children! Make your home happy. Be honest with them. Divide fairly with them in everything.

People justify all kinds of tyranny towards children upon the ground that they are totally depraved. At the bottom of ages of cruelty lies this infamous doctrine of total depravity. Religion contemplates a child as a living crime—heir to an infinite curse—doomed to eternal fire.

In the olden time, they thought some days were too good for a child to enjoy himself. When I was a boy, Sunday was considered altogether too holy to be happy in. Sunday used to commence then when the sun went down on Saturday night. We commenced at that time getting a good ready, and when the sun fell below the horizon on Saturday evening, there was a darkness fell upon the house ten thousand times deeper than that of night. Nobody said a pleasant word; nobody laughed; nobody smiled; the child that looked the sickest was regarded as the most pious. That night you could not even crack hickory nuts, and if you were caught chewing gum it was only another sign of the total depravity of the human heart. It was an exceedingly solemn night. Dyspepsia was in the very air you breathed. Everybody looked end and mournful. I have noticed all my life that many people think they have religion when they are troubled with dyspepsia. If there could be found an absolute specific for that disease, it would be the hardest blow the church has ever received.

On Sunday morning the solemnity hail simply increased. Then we went to church. The minister was in a pulpit about twenty feet high, with a little sounding board above him, and he commenced at "firstly," and went on and on and on to about "twenty-thirdly." Then he made a few remarks by way of application; then he took a general view of the subject, and in about two hours he reached the last chapter in Revelations.

In those days no matter how cold the weather was, there was no fire in the church. It was thought to be a kind of sin to be comfortable while you were thanking God. The first church that ever had a stove in it in New England, divided on that account. So the first church in which they sang by note, was torn to fragments.

After the sermon we had an intermission. Then came the catechism with the chief end of man. We went through with that. We sat in a row with our feet coming in about six inches of the floor. The minister asked us if we all knew we deserved to go to hell, and we all answered "Yes."

Then the same sermon was preached once more, commencing at the end and going back. After that we started for home, sad and solemn—overpowered with the wisdom displayed in the scheme of the atonement. When we got home, if we had been good boys, and the weather was warm, sometimes they would take us out to the graveyard to cheer us up a little. It did cheer me. When I looked at the sunken tombs and the leaning stones, and read the half effaced inscriptions through the moss of silence and forgetfulness, it was a great comfort. The recollection came to my mind that the observance of the Sabbath could not last always. Sometimes they would sing that beautiful hymn in which occurs those cheerful lines:

*"Where congregations ne'er break up,
And Sabbaths never end."*

These lines, I think, prejudiced me a little against even heaven. Then we had good books that we read on Sundays by way of keeping us happy and contented. There were Baxters "Call to the unconverted," Milner's "History of the Waldenses," and Jenkyns "On the Atonement." I used to read Jenkyns and often thought that an atone-ment would have to be exceedingly broad in its provisions to cover the case of a man who would write a book like that for a boy.

But at last Sunday wore away, and the moment the sun went down we were free. Between three and four o'clock we would go out to see how the sun was getting on. Sometimes it seemed to me that it was stopping from pure meanness. But finally it went down. It had to. And when the last rim of light sank below the horizon, off would go our caps, and we would give three cheers for liberty once more.

Sabbaths used to be prisons. Every Sunday was a Bastille. Every christian was a kind of turnkey, and every child was a prisoner—a convict. In that dungeon a smile was a crime.

It was thought wrong for a child to laugh upon this holy day. Think of that!

A little child would go out into the garden, and there would be a tree laden with blossoms, and the little fellow would lean against it, and there would be a bird on one of the boughs, singing and swinging and thinking about four little speckled eggs, warmed by the breast of Its mate—singing and swinging, and the music in happy waves rippling out of its tiny throat, and the flowers blossoming, the air filled with perfume and the great white clouds floating in the sky, and the little boy would lean up against that tree and think about hell and the worm that never dies.

The laugh of a child will make the holiest day more sacred still. Strike with the hand of fire, O weird musician, thy harp strung with Apollo's golden hair; fill the vast cathedral aisles with symphonies sweet and

dim, deft toucher of the organ keys; but know, your sweetest strains are discords all, compared with childhood's happy laugh—the laugh that fills the eyes with light and every heart with joy. O rippling river of laughter, thou art the blessed boundry line between the beast and men, and every wayward wave of thine doth drown some fretful fiend of care. O Laughter, rose lipped daughter of Joy, there are dimples enough in thy cheeks to catch and hold and glorify all the tears of grief.

And yet die minds of children have been polluted by this infamous doctrine of eternal punishment I despise it with every drop of my blood, and denounce it to day as a doctrine the infamy of which no language is sufficient to express.

When the great ship containing the hopes and aspirations of the world, and freighted with mankind goes down in the night of death, chaos and disaster, I am willing to go down with the ship. I will not be guilty of the ineffable meanness of paddling away in some orthodox canoe. I will go down with the ship with those who love me, and with those whom I have loved. If there is a God who will damn his children for ever, I would rather go to hell than go to heaven and keep the company of such an infamous tyrant. I make my choice now I despise the doctrine. It has covered the cheeks of this world with tears. It has polluted the hearts of children, and poisoned the imagination of men. It has been a constant pain, a perpetual terror to every good man and woman and child. It has filled the good with horror and with fear; but it has had no effect on the infamous and the base. It has wrung the hearts of the tender; it has furrowed the cheeks of the good. This doctrine never should be preached again. What right have you, Sir, Mr. Clergyman, you, minister of the gospel, to stand at the portals of the tomb, at the vestibule of eternity, and fill the future with horror and with fear? I do not believe this doctrine; neither do you. If you did you could not sleep one moment. Any man who believes it, and has within his breast a decent throbbing heart, will go insane. A man who believes that doctrine and does not go insane has the heart of a snake and the conscience of a hyena.

These doctrines have been taught in the name of religion, in the name of universal forgiveness, in the name of infinite love and charity. Do not, I pray you, soil the minds of your children with this dogma. Let them read for themselves; let them think for themselves.

I have given you my honest thought. Surely investigation is better than unthinking faith. Surely reason is a better guide than fear. This world should be governed by the living not by the dead. The grave is not a throne, and a corpse is not a king. Man should not try to live on ashes.

The theologians dead, knew no more than the theologians now living. More than this cannot be said. About this world little is known—about another world nothing.

Our fathers were intellectual serfs, and their fathers were slaves. The makers of our creeds were ignorant and brutal. Every dogma that we have, has upon it the mark of whip, the rust of chain, and the ashes of faggot.

Our fathers reasoned with instruments of torture. They believed in the logic of fire and sword. They hated reason. They despised thought. They abhorred liberty.

I do not pretend to tell what all the truth is. I do not pretend to have fathomed the abyss, nor to have floated on outstretched wings level with the dim heights of thought. I simply plead for freedom, I ask for light and air for the souls of men. I say, take off those chains—break those manacles—free those limbs—release that brain! I plead for the right to think—to reason—to investigate. I ask that the future may be enriched with the honest thoughts of men, I implore every human being to be a soldier in the army of progress.

I will not invade the rights of others. You have no right to erect your toll gate upon the highways of thought. You have no right to leap from the hedges of superstition and strike down the pioneers of the human race. Believe what you may; preach what you desire; have all the forms and ceremonies you please; exercise your liberty in your own way but extend to all others the same right.

I attack the monsters, the phantoms of imagination that have ruled the whole world.

Why should we sacrifice a real world that we have, for one we know not of? Why should we forge fetters for our own hands? Why should we be the slaves of phantoms? The darkness of barbarism was the womb of these shadows. In the light of science they cannot cloud the sky for ever. They have reddened the hands of man with innocent blood. They made the cradle a curse and the grave a place of torment.

They filled the future with heavens and with hells, with the shining peaks of selfish joy and the lurid abysses of flame. For ages they have kept the world in ignorance and awe, in want and misery, in fear and chains.

Man is greater than the phantoms. Humanity is grander than all the creeds, than all the books. Humanity is the great sea, and these creeds, and books, and religions, are but the waves of a day. Humanity is the sky and these religions and dogmas and theories are but the mists and clouds changing continually, destined finally to melt away.

Superstition is the child of slavery. Free thought will give us truth. When all have the right to think and to express their thoughts, every brain will give to all the best it has. The world will then be filled with intellectual wealth.

As long as men and women are afraid of the church, as long as a minister inspires fear, as long as people reverence a thing simply because they do not understand it, as long as it is respectable to lose your self respect, as long as the church has power, as long as mankind worship a book, just so long will the world be filled with intellectual paupers and vagrants, covered with the soiled and faded rages of superstition.

There has never been upon the earth a generation of free men and women. It is not yet time to write a creed. Wait until the chains are broken—until solemnity is not regarded as wisdom—until mental cowardice ceases to be known as reverence. Wait until the living are considered the equals of the dead—until the cradle takes the precedence of the coffin. Wait until what we know can be spoken without regard to what others may believe. Wait until teachers take the place of preachers—until followers become investigators. Wait until the world is free before you write a creed.

In this creed there will be but one word—Liberty.

Oh, Liberty, float not for ever in the far horizon—remain not for ever in the dream of the enthusiast, the philanthropist and poet, but come and make thy home among the children of men!

I know not what discoveries, what inventions, what thought may leap from the brain of the world. I know not what garments of glory may be woven by the years to come. I cannot dream of the victories to be won upon the fields of thought; but I do know, that coming from the infinite sea of the future, there will never touch this "bank and shoal of time" a richer gift, a rarer blessing than liberty for man, for woman, and for child.

A Collection of COLONEL INGERSOLL'S Orations, including the "Oration on the Gods," "Thomas Paine," "Heretics and Heresies," "Humboldt," and "Arraignment of the Church," in neatly bound limp cloth volume, price 1/6, or mailed to any address for 1/7, can be had of W. H. MORRISH, Bookseller, 18, Narrow Wine Street, Bristol.

Ingersoll's

Latest Oration on Thomas Paine.

Ladies and Gentlemen—It so happened that the first speech, the very first public speech, I ever made I took occasion to defend the memory of Thomas Paine.

I did it because I had read a little something of the history of my country. I did it because I felt indebted to him for the liberty I then enjoyed; and, whatever religion may be, ingratitude is the blackest of crime. And whether there is any God or not, in every star that shines, gratitude is a virtue.

The man who will tell

Truth about the Dead

is a good man; and, for one, about this man I intend to tell just as near the truth as I can.

Most history consists in giving the details of things that never happened; most biography is usually the lie coming from the lips of flattery, or the slander coming from the lips of malice; and whoever attacks the religion of a country will in his turn be attacked. Whoever attacks a superstition will find that superstition defended by all the meanness of ingenuity. Whoever attacks a superstition will find that there is still one weapon left in the arsenal of Jehovah—slander.

I was reading on yesterday a poem called the "Light of Asia," and I read in that how a Boodh, seeing a tigress perishing of thirst, with her mouth upon the dry stone of a stream, with her two cubs sucking at her dry and empty dugs, this Boodh took pity upon this wild and famishing beast; and throwing from himself the yellow robe of his order, and stepping naked before this tigress, said:—"Here is meat for you and for your cubs." In one moment the crooked daggers of her claws ran riot in his flesh, and in another he was devoured. Such, during nearly all the history of this world, has been the history of every man who has stood in front of superstition.

Thomas Paine, as has been so eloquently said by the gentleman who introduced me, was

A Friend of Man,

and whoever is a friend of man is also a friend of God—if there is one. But God has had many friends who were the enemies of their fellow-men. There is but one test by which to measure any man who has lived:—Did he leave this world better than he found it? Did he leave in this world more liberty? Did he leave in this world more goodness, more humanity, than when he was born? That is the test. And whatever may have been the

faults of Thomas Paine, no American who appreciates liberty, no American who believes in true democracy and in pure republicanism, should ever breathe one word against his name. Every American, with the divine mantle of charity, should cover all his faults, and with a never-tiring tongue should recount his virtues. He was a common man. He did not belong to the aristocracy. Upon the head of his father God had never poured the divine petroleum of authority. He had not the misfortune to belong to the upper classes. He had the fortune to be born among the poor, and to feel against his great heart the throb of the toiling and suffering masses. Neither was it his misfortune to have been educated at Oxford. What little sense he had was not squeezed out at West-minster. He got his education from books. He got his education from contact with his fellow-men, and he *thought*; and a man is worth just what nature impresses upon him. A man standing by the sea, or in a forest, or looking at a flower, or hearing a poem, or looking into the eyes of the woman he loves, receives all that he is capable of receiving; and if he is a great man the impression is great, and he uses it for his purpose of benefiting his fellow-man.

Thomas Paine was not rich. He was poor, and his father before him was poor; and he was raised a stay-maker, a very lowly profession; and yet that man became

One of the Mainstays of Liberty

in this world. At one time he was an exciseman, like Burns. Burns was once—speak it softly—a gauger; and yet he wrote poems that will wet the cheek of humanity with tears as long as this world travels in its orb around the sun.

Poverty was his brother, necessity his master. He had more brains than books, more courage than politeness, more strength than polish. He had no veneration for old mistakes; no admiration for ancient lies. He loved the truth for truth's sake and for man's sake. He saw oppression on every hand, injustice everywhere, hypocrisy at the altar, venality on the bench, tyranny on the throne; and, with a splendid courage, he espoused the cause of the weak against the strong, of the enslaved man against the titled few.

In England he was nothing. He belonged to the lower classes—that is the usual people. England depended for her prosperity upon her mechanics and her thinkers, her sailors and her workers; and they are the only men in Europe who are not gentlemen. The only obstacles in the way of progress in Europe were the nobility and the priests, and they are the only gentlemen.

This, and his native genius, constituted his entire capital; and he needed no more. He found the colonies clamouring for justice, whining about their grievances; upon their knees at the foot of the throne, imploring that mixture of idiocy and insanity—George III., by the grace of God—for a restoration of their ancient privileges. They were not endeavouring to become free men, but were trying to soften the heart of their master. They were perfectly willing to make brick if Pharaoh would furnish the straw. The colonists wished for, hoped for, and prayed for reconciliation. They did not dream of independence.

Paine gave to the world his "Common Sense." It was the first argument for separation, the first assault upon the British form of government the first blow for a republic; and it aroused our fathers like a trumpet's blast. He was the first to perceive the destiny of the New World. No other pamphlet ever accomplished such wonderful results. It was filled with arguments, reason, persuasion, and unanswerable logic. It opened a new world. It filled the present with hope and the future with honour. Everywhere the people responded, and in a few months the Continental Congress declared the colonies free and independent States.

A new nation was born.

It is simple justice to say that Paine did more to cause the Declaration of Independence than any other man. Neither should it be forgotten that his attacks upon Great Britain were also attacks upon monarchy; and while he convinced the people that the colonies ought to separate from the mother-country, he also proved to them that a free government is the best that can be instituted among men.

In my judgment, Thomas Paine was

The Best Political Writer that Ever Lived.

"What he wrote was pure nature, and his soul and his pen ever went together." Ceremony, pageantry, and all the paraphernalia of power, had no effect upon him. He examined into the why and wherefore of things. He was perfectly radical in his mode of thought. Nothing short of the bed-rock satisfied him. His enthusiasm for what he believed to be right knew no bounds. During all the dark scenes of the revolution, never for a moment did he despair. Year after year his brave words were ringing through the land, and by the bivouac fires the weary soldiers read the inspiring words of "Common Sense," filled with ideas sharper than their swords, and consecrated themselves anew to the cause of freedom.

Paine was not content with having aroused the spirit of independence, but he gave every energy of his soul

to keep that spirit alive. He was with the army. He shared its defeats, its dangers, and its glory. When the situation became desperate, when gloom settled upon all, he gave them the "Crisis," It was a cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night, leading the way to freedom, honour, and glory. He shouted to them—

"These are the Times that Try Men's Souls."

The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of his country; but he that stands it now deserves the love and thanks of man and woman."

To those who wished to put the war off to some future day, with a lofty and touching spirit of self-sacrifice, he said—"Every generous parent should say, 'If there must be war let it be in my day, that my child may have peace.'" To the cry that Americans were rebels he replied—"He that rebels against reason is a real rebel; but he that, in defence of reason, rebels against tyranny, has a better title to 'Defender of the Faith' than George III."

Some said it was to the interest of the colonies to be free. Paine answered this by saying—"To know whether it be the interest of the colonies to be independent we need only ask this simple, easy question: Is it the interest of a man to be a boy all his life?" He found many who would listen to nothing, and to them he said that "to argue with a man who has renounced his reason is like giving medicine to the dead." This sentiment ought to adorn the walls of every orthodox church.

There is a world of political wisdom in this—"England lost her liberty in a long chain of wrong reasoning from right principles;" and there is real discrimination in saying—"The Greeks and Romans were strongly possessed of the spirit of liberty, but not the principles; for at the time that they were determined not to be slaves themselves they employed their power to enslave the rest of mankind."

In his letter to the British people, in which he tried to convince them that war was not to their interest, occurs the following passage, brimful of common sense:—"War never can be the interest of a trading nation, any more than quarrelling can be profitable to a man in business. But to make war with those who trade with us is like setting a bulldog upon a customer at the shop-door.

The writings of Paine fairly glitter with simple compact, logical statements that carry conviction to the dullest and most prejudiced. He had the happiest possible way of putting the case, in asking questions in such a way that they answer themselves, and in stating his premises so clearly that the deduction could not be avoided.

Day and night he laboured for America. Month after month, year after year, he gave himself to the great cause, until there was "a government of the people and for the people," and until the banner of the stars floated over a continent redeemed and consecrated to the happiness of mankind.

At the close of the revolution no one stood higher in America than Thomas Paine. The best, the wisest, the most patriotic were his friends and admirers; and had he been thinking only of his own good he might have rested from his toils and spent the remainder of his life in comfort and in ease. He could have been what the world is pleased to call "respectable." He could have died surrounded by clergymen, warriors, and statesmen; and at his death there would have been an imposing funeral, miles of carriages, civic societies, salvos of artillery, a nation in mourning, and, above all,

A Splendid Monument Covered with Lies.'

He chose rather to benefit mankind.

At that time the seeds sown by the great infidels were beginning to bear fruit in France.

The eighteenth century was crowning its gray hairs with the wreath of progress.

On every hand science was bearing testimony against the Church. Voltaire had filled Europe with light; D'Holbach was giving to the *elite* of Paris the principles contained in his "System of Nature." The encyclopædists had attacked superstition with information for the masses. The foundation of things began to be examined. A few had the courage to keep their shoes on and let the bush burn. Miracles began to get scarce. Everywhere the people began to enquire. America had set an example to the world. The word liberty was in the mouths of men, and they began to wipe the dust from their superstitious knees.

The dawn of a new day had appeared.

Thomas Paine went to France. Into the new movement he threw all his energies. His fame had gone before him, and he was welcomed as a friend of the human race and as a champion of free government.

He never relinquished his intention of pointing out to his countrymen the defects, absurdities, and abuses of the English government. For this purpose he composed and published his greatest political work,

"The Rights of Man."

This work should be read by every man and woman. It is concise, accurate, rational, convincing, and unanswerable. It shows great thought, an intimate knowledge of the various forms of government, deep insight

into the very springs of human action, and a courage that compels respect and admiration. The most difficult political problems are solved in a few sentences. The venerable arguments in favour of wrong are refuted with a question—answered with a word. For forcible illustration, apt comparison, accuracy and clearness of statement, and absolute thoroughness it has never been excelled.

The fears of the administration were aroused, and Paine was prosecuted for libel and found guilty; and yet there is no sentiment in the entire work that will not challenge the admiration of every civilised man. It is a magazine of political wisdom, an arsenal of ideas, and an honour not only to Thomas Paine but to human nature itself. It could have been written only by the man who had the generosity, the exalted patriotism, the goodness to say—"The world is my country, and to do good my religion."

There is in all the utterances of the world no grander, no sublimer sentiment. There is no creed that can be compared with it for a moment. It should be wrought in gold, adorned with jewels, and impressed upon every human heart.

"The World is My Country, and to Do Good My Religion."

In 1792 Paine was elected by the department of Calais as their representative in the National Assembly. So great was his popularity in France that he was selected about the same time by the people of no less than four departments.

Upon taking his place in the Assembly he was appointed as one of a committee to draft a constitution for France. Had the French people taken the advice of Thomas Paine there would have been no "Reign of Terror." The streets of Paris would not have been filled with blood in that Reign of Terror. There were killed in the city of Paris not less, I think, than 17,000 people; and one night, in the massacre of St. Bartholomew, there were killed by assassination over 70,000 souls—men, women, and children. The revolution would have been the grandest success of the world. The truth is that Paine was too conservative to suit the leaders of the French revolution. They, to a great extent, were carried away by hatred and a desire to destroy. They had suffered so long, they had borne so much, that it was impossible for them to be moderate in the hour of victory.

Besides all this, the French people had been so robbed by the Government, so degraded by the Church, that they were not fit material with which to construct a republic. Many of the leaders longed to establish a beneficent and just government, but the people asked for revenge.

Paine was

Filled with a Real Love for Mankind.

His philanthropy was boundless. He wished to destroy monarchy—not the monarch. He voted for the destruction of tyranny, and against the death of the tyrant. He wished to establish a government on a new basis—one that would forget the past, one that would give privileges to none, and protection to all.

In the Assembly, where all were demanding the execution of the king,—where to differ with the majority was to be suspected, and where to be suspected was almost certain death—Thomas Paine had the courage, the goodness, and the justice to vote against death. To vote against the execution of the king was

A Vote Against his Own Life.

This was the sublimity of devotion to principle. For this he was arrested, imprisoned, and doomed to death. There is not a theologian who has ever maligned Thomas Paine that has the courage to do this thing.

When Louis Capet was on trial for his life before the French Convention, Thomas Paine had the courage to speak and vote against the sentence of death. In his speech I find the following

Splendid Sentiments:

"My contempt and hatred for monarchical governments are sufficiently well known, and my compassion for the unfortunate, friends or enemies, is equally profound.

"I have voted to put Louis Capet upon trial because it was necessary to prove to the world the perfidy, the corruption, and the horror of the monarchical system.

"To follow the trade of a king destroys all morality, just as the trade of a jailer deadens all sensibility.

"Make a man a king to-day and to-morrow he will be a brigand.

"Had Louis Capet been a farmer he might have been held in esteem by his neighbours, and his wickedness results from his position rather than from his nature.

"Let the French nation purge its territory of kings without soiling itself with their impure blood.

"Let the United States be the asylum of Louis Capet, where, in spite of the over-shadowing miseries and

crimes of a royal life, he will learn by the continual contemplation of the general prosperity that the true system of government is not that of kings, but of the people.

"I am an enemy of kings, but I cannot forget that they belong to the human race.

"It is always delightful to pursue that course where policy and humanity are united.

"As France has been the first of all the nations of Europe to destroy royalty, let it be the first to abolish the penalty of death.

"As a true republican, I consider kings as more the objects of contempt than of vengeance."

Search the records of the world and you will find but few sublimer acts than that of Thomas Paine voting against the king's death. He, the hater of despotism, the abhorer of monarchy, the champion of the rights of man, republican, accepting death to save the life of a deposed tyrant—of a throneless king! This was the last grand act of his political life—the sublime conclusion of his political career.

All his life he had been the disinterested friend of man. He had laboured not for money, nor for fame, but for the general good. He had aspired to no office. He had no recognition of his services, but had ever been content to labour as a common soldier in the army of progress, confining his efforts to no country, looking upon the world as his field of action. Filled with a genuine love for the right, he found himself imprisoned by the very people he had striven to save.

Had his enemies succeed in bringing him to the block, he would have escaped the calumnies and the hatred of the Christian world. And let me tell you how near they came getting him to the block. He was in prison; there was a door to his cell—it had two doors, a door that opened in and an iron door that opened out. It was a dark passage, and whenever the concluded to cut a man's head off the next day an agent went along and made a chalk-mark upon the door where the poor prisoner was bound. Mr. Barlow, the American minister, happened to be with him and the outer door was shut, that is, open against the wall, and the inner door was shut, and when the man came along whose business it was to mark the door for death he marked this door where Thomas Paine was, but he marked the door that was against the wall, so when it was shut the mark was inside, and

The Messenger of Death Passed by

on the next day. If that had happened in favour of some Methodist preacher they would have clearly seen, not simply the hand of God, but both hand. In this country, at least, he would have ranked with the proudest names. On the anniversary of the declaration his name would have been upon the lips of all orators, and his memory in the hearts of all the people.

Thomas Paine had not finished his career, He had spent his life thus far in destroying the power of kings, and now he turned his attention to the priests. He knew that every abuse had been embalmed in Scripture—that every outrage was in partnership with some holy text. He knew that the throne skulked behind the altar, and both behind a pretended revelation from God. By this time he had found that it was of little use to free the body and leave the mind in chains. He had explored the foundations of despotism, and had found them infinitely rotten. He had dug under the throne, and it occurred to him that he would

Take a Look behind the Altar.

The result of this investigation was given to the world in the "Age of Reason." From the moment of its publication he became infamous. He was culminated beyond measure. To slander him was to secure the thanks of the church. All his services were instantly forgotten, disparaged, or denied. He was shunned as though he had been a pestilence. Most of his old friends forsook him. He was regarded as a moral plague, and at the bare mention of his name the bloody hands of the church were raised in horror. He was denounced as the most despicable of men.

Not content with following him to his grave, they pursued him after death with redoubled fury, and recounted with infinite gusto and satisfaction the supposed horrors of his death-bed; glorified in fact that he forlorn and friendless, and gloated like fiends over what they supposed to be the agonising remorse of his lonely death.

It is wonderful that all his services were thus forgotten. It is amazing that one kind word did not fall from some pulpit; that some one did not accord to him, at least—honesty. Strange that in the general denunciation some one did not remember his labour for liberty, his devotion to principle, his zeal for the rights of his fellow-men. He had, by brave and splendid efforts, associated his name with the cause of progress. He had made it impossible to write the history of political freedom with his name left out. He was one of the creators of light; one of the heralds of the dawn. He hated tyranny in the name of kings, and in the name of God, with every drop of his noble blood. He believed in liberty and justice, and in the sacred doctrine of human equality. Under these divine banners he fought the battle of his life. In both worlds he offered his blood for the good of

man. In the wilderness of America, in the French Assembly, in the sombre cell waiting for death, he was the same unflinching, unwavering friend of his race; the same undaunted champion of universal freedom. And for this he has been hated; for this

The Church has Violated Even his Grave.

This is enough to make one believe that nothing is more natural than for men to devour their benefactors. The people in all ages have crucified and glorified. Whoever lifts his voice against abuse, whoever arraigns the past at the bar of the present, whoever asks the king to show his commission, or question the authority of the priest, will be denounced as the enemy of man and God. In all ages reason has been regarded as the enemy of religion. Nothing has been considered so pleasing to the Deity as a total denial of the authority of your own mind. Self-reliance has been thought deadly sin; and the idea of living and dying without the aid and consolation of superstition has always horrified the church. By some unaccountable infatuation, belief has been and still is considered of immense importance. All religions have been based upon the idea that God will forever reward the true believer, and eternally damn the man who doubts or denies. Belief is regarded as the one essential thing. To practice justice, to love mercy, is not enough;

You Must Believe

in some incomprehensible creed. You must say—"Once one is three, and three times one is one." The man who practised every virtue but failed to believe was execrated. Nothing so outrages the feelings of the Church as a moral unbeliever; nothing so horrible as a charitable atheist.

When Paine was born the world was religious. The pulpit was the real throne, and the Churches were making every effort to crush out of the brain the idea that it had the right to think.

He again made up his mind to sacrifice himself. He commenced with the assertion, "That any system of religion that has anything in it that shocks the mind of a child cannot be a true system." What a beautiful, what a tender sentiment! No wonder the Church began to hate him.

He Believed in One God, and in No More.

After this life he hoped for happiness. He believed that true religion consisted in doing justice, loving mercy, in endeavouring to make our fellow-creatures happy, and in offering to God the fruit of the heart. He denied the inspiration of the Scriptures. This was his crime.

He contended that it is a contradiction in terms to call anything a revelation that comes to us at second hand, either verbally or in writing. He asserted that revelation is necessarily limited to the first communication, and that after that it is only an account of something which another person says was a revelation to him. We have only his word for it, as it was never made to us. This argument never has been, and probably never will be, answered. He denied the divine origin of Christ, and showed conclusively that the pretended prophecies of the Old Testament had no reference to him whatever. And yet he believed that Christ was a virtuous and amiable man; that the morality he taught and practised was of the most benevolent and elevated character, and that it had not been exceeded by any. Upon this point he entertained the same sentiments now held by the unitarians, and in fact by all the most enlightened Christians.

In his time the Church believed and taught that every word in the Bible was absolutely true. Since his day it has been proven false in its cosmogony, false in its astronomy, false in its chronology and geology, false in its history, and—so far as the Old Testament is concerned—false in almost everything. There are but few, if any, scientific men who apprehend that the Bible is literally true. Who on earth at this day, would pretend to settle any scientific question by a text from the Bible? The old belief is confined to the ignorant and zealous. The Church itself will before long be driven to occupy the position of Thomas Paine. The best minds of the orthodox world to-day are endeavouring to prove the existence of a personal Deity. All other questions occupy a minor place. You are no longer asked to swallow the Bible whole,

Whale, Jonah, and All.

You are simply required to believe in God and pay your pew-rent. There is not now an enlightened minister in the world who will seriously contend that Samson's strength was in his hair, or that necromancers of Egypt could turn water into blood and pieces of wood into serpents. These follies have passed away, and the only reason that the religious world can now have for disliking Paine is that they have been forced to adopt so many of his opinions.

Paine thought the barbarities of the Old Testament inconsistent with what he deemed the real character of

God. He believed the murder, massacre, and indiscriminate slaughter had never been commanded by the Deity. He regarded much of the Bible as childish, unimportant, and foolish. The scientific world entertained the same opinion. Paine attacked the Bible precisely in the same spirit in which he had attacked the pretensions of the kings. He used the same weapons. All the pomp in the world could not make him cower. His reason knew no "Holy of Holies," except the abode of truth. The sciences were then in their infancy. The attention of the really learned had not been directed to an impartial examination of our pretended revelation. It was accepted by most as a matter of course. The Church was all-powerful; and no one else, unless thoroughly imbued with the spirit of self-sacrifice, thought for a moment of disputing the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. The infamous doctrine that salvation depends upon belief—upon a mere intellectual conviction—was then believed and preached. To doubt was to secure the damnation of your soul. This absurd and devilish doctrine shocked the common sense of Thomas Paine, and he denounced it with the fervour of honest indignation. This doctrine, although infinitely ridiculous, has been nearly universal, and has been as hurtful as senseless. For the overthrow of this infamous tenet Paine exerted all his strength. He left few arguments to be used by those who should come after him, and

He Used None that have been Refuted.

The combined wisdom and genius of all mankind cannot possibly conceive of an argument against liberty of thought. Neither can they show why any one should be punished, either in this world or another, for acting honestly in accordance with reason; and yet a doctrine with every possible argument against it has been, and still is, believed and defended by the entire orthodox world. Can it be possible that we have been endowed with reason simply that our souls may be caught in its toils and snares, that we may be led by its false and delusive glare out of the narrow path that leads to joy into the broad way of everlasting death? Is it possible that we have been given reason simply that we may through faith ignore its deductions and avoid its conclusions! Ought the sailor to throw away his compass and depend entirely upon the fog? If reason is not to be depended upon in matters of religion—that is to say, in respect of our duties to the Deity—why should it be relied upon in matters respecting the rights of our fellows? Why should we throw away the law given to Moses by God himself, and have the audacity to make some of our own? How dare we drown the thunders of Sinai by calling the eyes and noses in a petty legislature? If reason can determine what is merciful, what is just, the duties of man to man, what more do we want either in time or eternity? Down, for ever down, with any religion that requires upon its ignorant altar its sacrifice of the goddess Reason; that compels her to abdicate for ever the shining throne of the soul, strips from her form the imperial purple, snatches from her hand the sceptre of thought, and makes her the bondswoman of a senseless faith.

If a man should tell you he had the most beautiful painting in the world, and after taking you where it was should insist upon having your eyes shut, you would likely suspect either that he had no painting or that it was some pitiable daub. Should he tell you that he was a most excellent performer on the violin, and yet refused to play unless your cars were stopped, you would think, to say the least of it, that he had an odd way of convincing you of his musical ability. But would his conduct be any more wonderful than that of a religionist who asks that before examining his creed you will have the kindness to throw away your reason? The first gentleman says:—"Keep your eyes shut; my picture will bear everything but being seen." "Keep your ears stopped; my music objects to nothing but being heard." The last says:—"Away with your reason; my religion dreads nothing but being understood."

So far as I am concerned, I most cheerfully admit that most Christians are honest and most ministers sincere. We do not attack them;

We Attack their Creed.

We accord to them the same rights that we ask for ourselves. We believe that their doctrines are hurtful, and I am going to do what I can against them. We believe that the frightful text—"He that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned," has covered the earth with blood. You might as well say all that have red hair shall be damned. It has filled the heart with arrogance, cruelty, and murder. It has caused the religious wars, bound hundreds of thousands to the stake, founded Inquisitions, filled dungeons, invented instruments of torture, taught the mother to hate her child, imprisoned the mind, filled the world with ignorance, persecuted the lovers of wisdom, built the monasteries and convents, made happiness a crime, investigation a sin, and self-reliance a blasphemy. It has poisoned the springs of learning, misdirected the energies of the world, filled all countries with want, housed the people in hovels, fed them with famine; and but for the efforts of a few brave infidels it would have taken the world back to the midnight of barbarism, and left the heavens without a star.

The maligners of Paine say that he had no right to attack this doctrine, because

He was Unacquainted with the Dead Languages,

and for this reason it was a piece of pure impudence in him to investigate the Scriptures.

Is it necessary to understand Hebrew in order to know that cruelty is not a virtue, that murder is inconsistent with infinite goodness, and that eternal punishment, can be inflicted upon man only by an eternal fiend? Is it really essential to conjugate the Greek verbs before you can make up your mind as to the probability of dead people getting out of their graves? Must one be versed in Latin before he is entitled to express an opinion as to the genuineness of a pretended revelation from God? Common sense belongs exclusively to no tongue. Logic is not confined to, nor has it been buried with, the dead languages. Paine attacked the Bible as it is translated. If the translation is wrong let its defenders correct it."

The Christianity of Paine's day is not the Christianity of our time. There has been a great improvement since then. It is better now, because there is less of it. One hundred and fifty years ago the foremost preachers of our time—that gentleman who preaches in this magnificent hall—would have perished at the stake. Lord, Lord, how John Calvin would have liked to have roasted this man! and the perfume of his burning flesh would have filled heaven with joy. A Universalist would have been torn in pieces in England, Scotland, and America. Unitarians would have found themselves in the stocks, pelted by the rabble with dead cats; after which their ears would have been cut off, their tongues bored, and their foreheads branded. Less than one hundred and fifty years ago the following law was

In Force in Maryland.

"Be it enacted by the Right Honourable the Lord Proprietor, by and with the advice and consent of His Lordship's Governor and the Upper and Lower Houses of the Assembly, and the authority of the same:

"That if any person shall hereafter, within this province, willingly, maliciously and advisedly, by writing or speaking, blaspheme or curse God, or deny Our Saviour Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, or shall deny the Holy Trinity, the Father, Son, and the Holy Ghost, or the Godhead of any of the three Persons, or the unity of the Godhead, or shall utter any profane words concerning the Holy Trinity or the Persons thereof, and shall therefor be convicted by verdict, shall for the first offence be bored through the tongue, and fined £20, to be levied of his body. As for the second offence the offender shall be stigmatised by burning in the forehead the letter B, and fined £40. And that for the third offence the offender shall suffer death without the benefit of clergy."

The strange thing about this law is that it has never been respected, and was in force in the District of Columbia up to 1875. Laws like this were in force in most of the colonies and in all countries where the Church had power.

In the Old Testament the death penalty was attached to hundreds of offences. It has been the same in all Christian countries. Today, in civilised governments, the death penalty is attached only to murder and treason and in some it has been entirely abolished. What a commentary upon the divine systems of the world!

In the day of Thomas Paine

The Church was Ignorant, Bloody, and Relentless.

In Scotland the "kirk" was at the summit of its power. It was a full sister of the Spanish Inquisition. It waged war upon human nature. It was the enemy of happiness, the hater of joy, and the despiser of liberty. It taught parents to murder their children rather than to allow them to propagate error. If the mother held opinions of which the infamous "kirk" disapproved, her children were taken from her arms, her babe from her very bosom, and she was not allowed to see them or write them a word. It would not allow shipwrecked sailors to be rescued from drowning on Sunday.

Oh, you have no idea what a must it kicks up in heaven to have anybody swim on Sunday. It fills all the wheeling worlds with sadness to see a boy in a boat, and the attention of the recording secretary is called to it. In a voice of thunder they say "Upset him."

It sought to annihilate pleasure, to pollute the heart by filling it with religious cruelty and gloom, and to change mankind into a vast horde of pious, heartless fiends. One of the most famous Scotch divines said—"The kirk holds that religious toleration is not far from blasphemy." And this same Scotch kirk denounced beyond measure the man who had the moral grandeur to say—"The world is my country, and to do good my religion" And this same kirk abhorred the man who said—"Any system of religion that shocks the mind of a child cannot be a true system."

At that time nothing so delighted the Church as the beauties of endless torment, and listening to the weak

wailing of damned infants struggling in the slimy coils and poison folds of the worm that never dies.

About the beginning of the eighteenth century a boy by the name of Thomas Aikenhead was indicted and tried at Edinburgh for having denied the inspiration of the Scriptures, and for having on several occasions, when cold, wished himself in hell that he might get warm. Notwithstanding the poor boy recanted and begged for mercy, he was found guilty and hanged. His body was thrown in a hole at the foot of the scaffold and covered with stones; and though his mother came with her face covered with tears, begging for the corpse, she was denied and driven away in the name of charity. That is religion; and in the velvet of their politeness there lurk the claws of a tiger. Just give them the power, and see how quick I would leave this part of the country. They know I am going to be burned for ever; they know I am going to hell; but that don't satisfy them. They want to give me a little foretaste here.

Prosecutions and executions like these were common in every Christian country, and all of them based upon the belief that an intellectual conviction is a crime.

No wonder the Church hated and traduced the author of the "Age of Reason."

England was filled with Puritan gloom and Episcopal ceremony. The ideas of crazy fanatics and extravagant poets were taken as sober facts. Milton had clothed Christianity in the soiled and faded finery of the gods—had added to the story of Christ the fables of mythology. He gave to the Protestant Church the most outrageously material ideas of the Deity. He turned all the angels into soldiers, made Heaven a battle-field, put Christ in uniform, and described God as a militia general. His works were considered by the Protestants nearly as sacred as the Bible itself; and the imagination of the people was thoroughly polluted by the horrible imagery, the sublime absurdity, of the blind Milton. Heaven and hell were realities—the judgment day was expected—books of account would be opened. Every man would hear the charges against him read. God was supposed to sit upon a golden throne, surrounded by the tallest angels, with harps in their hands and crowns on their heads. The goats would be thrust into eternal fire on the left, while the orthodox sheep on the right were to gambol on sunny slopes for ever and for ever. So all the priests were willing to save the sheep for half the wool.

The nation was profoundly ignorant, and consequently extremely religious so far as belief was concerned.

In Europe liberty was lying chained in the Inquisition, her white bosom stained with blood. In the new world the Puritans had been hanging and burning in the name of God, and selling white Quaker children into slavery in the name of Christ, who said—"Suffer little children to come unto Me."

Under such conditions progress was impossible.

Some One had to Lead the Way.

The Church is, and always has been, incapable of a forward movement. Religion always looks back. The Church has already reduced Spain to a guitar, Italy to a hand-organ, and Ireland to exile.

Some one not connected with the Church had to attack the monster that was eating out the heart of the world. Some one had to sacrifice himself for the good of all. The people were in the most abject poverty; their manhood had been taken from them by pomp, by pageantry, and power.

Progress is born of doubt and enquiry.

The Church never doubts—never enquires. To doubt is heresy; to enquire is to admit that you do not know. The Church does neither.

More than a century ago Catholicism, wrapped in robes red with the innocent blood of millions, holding in her frantic clutch crowns and sceptres, honours and gold, the keys of Heaven and Hell, trampling beneath her feet the liberties of nations, in the proud moment of almost universal dominion felt within her heartless breast the deadly dagger of Voltaire. From that blow the Church can never recover. Livid with hatred, she launched her eternal anathema at the great destroyer, and ignorant Protestants have echoed the curse of Rome.

In our country the Church was all-powerful; and, although divided into many sects, would instantly unite to repel a common foe. Paine did for Protestantism what Voltaire did for Catholicism.

Paine Struck the First Grand Blow.

The "Age of Reason" did more to undermine the power of the Protestant Church than all other books then known. It furnished an immense amount of food for thought. It was written for the average mind, and is a straightforward honest investigation of the Bible and of the Christian system.

Paine did not falter from the first page to the last. He gives you his candid thought, and candid thoughts are always valuable.

The "Age of Reason" has liberalised us all. It put arguments in the mouths of the people; it put the Church on the defensive; it enabled somebody in every village to corner the parson; it made the world wiser, and the Church better; it took power from the pulpit, and divided it among the pews.

Just in proportion that the human race has advanced, the Church has lost its power. There is no exception to this rule. No nation ever materially advanced that held strictly to the religion of its founders. No nation ever gave itself wholly to the control of the Church without losing its power, its honour, and existence.

Every church pretends to have found the exact truth. This is the cud of progress. Why pursue that which you have? Why investigate when you know?

Every creed is a rock in running water; humanity sweeps by it. Every creed cries to the universe—Halt! A creed is the ignorant past bullying the enlightened present.

The ignorant are not satisfied with what can be demonstrated. Science is too slow for them, and so they invent creeds. They demand completeness. A sublime segment, a grand fragment, are of no value to them. They demand the complete circle—the entire structure.

In music they want a melody with a recurring accent at measured periods. In religion they insist upon immediate answers to the questions of creation and destiny. The alpha and omega of all things must be in the alphabet of their superstition. A religion that cannot answer every question and guess every conundrum is in their estimation, worse than worthless. They desire a kind of theological dictionary, a religious ready-reckoner, together with guide-boards at all crossings and turns. They mistake impudence for authority, solemnity for wisdom, and pathos for inspiration. The beginning and the end are what they demand. The grand flight of the eagle is nothing to them. They want the nest in which he was hatched, and especially the dry limb upon which he roosts. Anything that can be learned is hardly worth knowing. The present is considered of no value in itself. Happiness must not be expected this side of the clouds, and can only be attained by self-denial and faith: not self-denial for the good of others, but for the salvation of your own sweet self.

Paine denied the authority of Bibles and creeds. This was

His Crime,

and for this the world shut the door in his face, and emptied its slops upon him from the windows.

I challenge the world to show that Thomas Paine ever wrote one line—one word—in favour of tyranny, in favour of immorality; one word against what he believed to be for the highest and best interest of mankind; one line—one word—against justice, charity, or liberty; and yet he has been pursued as though he had been a fiend from hell. His memory has been execrated as though he had murdered some Uriah for his wife, driven some Hagar into the desert to starve with his child upon her bosom, defiled his own daughters, ripped open with the sword the sweet bodies of loving and innocent women, advised one brother to assassinate another, kept a harem with seven hundred wives and three hundred concubines, or had persecuted Christians even unto strange cities.

The Church has pursued Paine to deter others. The Church used painting, music and architecture simply to degrade mankind. But there are men that nothing can awe. There have been at all times brave spirits that dared even the gods. Some proud head has always been above the waves. Old Diogenes, with his mantle upon him, stiff and trembling with age, caught a small animal bred upon people, went into the Pantheon, the temple of the gods, and took the animal upon his thumbnail, and, pressing it with the other, he "sacrificed Diogenes to all the gods!" Just as good as anything. In every age some Diogenes has sacrificed to all the gods. True genius never cowers, and there is always some Samson feeling for the pillars of authority.

Cathedrals and domes, and chimes and chants; temples frescoed, and groined, and carved, and gilded with gold; altars, and tapers, and paintings of virgin and babe; censer and chalice; chasuble, paten, and alb; organs, and anthems, and incense rising to the winged and blest; maniple, amice, and stole; crosses and crosiers; tiaras and crowns; mitres, and missals, and masses; rosaries, relics, and robes; martyrs, and saints, and windows stained as with the blood of Christ—never, never for one moment awed the brave, proud spirit of the infidel. He knew that all the pomp and glitter had been purchased with liberty—that priceless jewel of the soul. In looking at the cathedral he remembered the dungeon. The music of the organ was not loud enough to drown the clank of fetters. He could not forget that the taper had lighted the fagot. He knew that the cross adorned the hilt of the sword; and so,

Where Others Worshipped, He Wept and Scorned.

He knew that across the open Bible lay the sword of war; and so, where others worshipped, he looked with scorn and wept. And so it has been through all the ages gone.

The doubter, the investigator, the infidel have been the saviours of liberty. The truth is beginning to be realised, and the truly intellectual are honouring the brave thinkers of the past.

But the Church is as unforgiving as ever, and still wonders why an infidel should be wicked enough to endeavour to destroy her power. I will tell the Church

Why I Hate it.

You have imprisoned the human mind; you have been the enemy of liberty; you have burned us at the stake, roasted us before slow fires, torn our flesh with irons; you have covered us with chains, treated us as outcasts; you have filled the world with fear; you have taken our wives and children from our arms; you have confiscated our property; you have denied us the right to testify in courts of justice; you have branded us with infamy; you have torn out our tongues; you have refused us burial. In the name of your religion you have robbed us of every right; and after having inflicted upon us every evil that can be inflicted in this world you have fallen upon your knees, and with clasped hands implored your God to finish the holy work in hell.

Can you wonder that we hate your doctrines, that we despise your creeds, that we feel proud to know that we are beyond your power—that we are free in spite of you, that we can express our honest thought, and that the whole world is grandly rising into the blessed light? Can you wonder that we point with pride to the fact that infidelity has ever been found battling for the rights of man, for the liberty of conscience, and for the happiness of all? Can you wonder that we I are proud to know that we have always been disciples of reason and soldiers of freedom; that we have denounced tyranny and superstition, and have kept our hands unstained with human blood!

I deny that religion is the end or object of this life. When it is so considered it becomes destructive of happiness. The real end of life is happiness. It becomes a hydra-headed monster, reaching in terrible coils from the heavens and thrusting its thousand fangs into the bleeding, quivering hearts of men. It devours their substance, builds palaces for God (who dwells not in temples made with hands), and allows His children to die in huts and hovels. It fills the earth with mourning, heaven with hatred, the present with fear, and all the future with fire and despair. Virtue is a subordination of the passions to the intellect. It is to act in accordance with your highest convictions. It does not consist in believing, but in doing. This is the sublime truth that infidels in all ages have uttered. They have handed the torch from one to the other through all the years that have fled. Upon the altar of reason they have kept the sacred fire, and throughout the long midnight of faith they fed the divine flame. Infidelity is liberty; all superstition is slavery. In every creed man is the slave of God, woman is the slave of man, and the sweet children are the slaves of all. We do not want creeds; we want some knowledge—we want happiness.

And yet we are told by the Church that we have accomplished nothing; that we are simply destroyers; that we tear down without building again.

Is it Nothing to Free the Mind?

Is it nothing to civilise mankind? Is it nothing to fill the world with light, with discovery, with science? Is it nothing to dignify man and exalt the intellect? Is it nothing to grope your way into the dreary prisons, the damp and dripping dungeons, the dark and silent cells of superstition, where the souls of men are chained to floors of stone; to greet them like a ray of light, like the song of a bird, the murmur of a stream; to see the dull eyes open and grow slowly bright, to feel yourself grasped by the shrunken and unused hands, and hear yourself thanked by a strange and hollow voice?

Is it nothing to conduct these souls gradually into the blessed light of day—to let them see again the happy fields, the sweet, green earth, and hear the everlasting music of the waves? Is it nothing to make men wipe the dust from their swollen knees, the tears from their blanched and furrowed cheeks? Is it a small thing to reave the heavens of an insatiate monster, and write upon the eternal dome, glittering with stars, the grand word

Liberty?

Is it a small thing to quench the thirst of hell with the holy tears of piety, break all the chains, put out the fires of civil war, stay the sword of the fanatic, and tear the bloody hands of the church from the white throat of progress? Is it a small thing to make men truly free, to destroy the dogmas of ignorance, prejudice, and power, the poisoned fables of superstition, and drive from the beautiful face of the earth the fiend of fear?

It does seem as though the most zealous Christians must at times entertain some doubt as to the divine origin of his religion. For eighteen hundred years the doctrine has been preached. For more than a thousand years the church had, to a great extent, the control of the civilised world, and what has been the result? Are the Christian nations patterns of charity and forbearance? On the contrary, their principal business is to destroy each other. More than five millions of Christians are trained and educated and drilled to murder their fellow-Christians. Every nation is groaning under a vast debt incurred in carrying on war against other Christians, or defending itself from Christian assault. The world is covered with forts to protect Christians from Christians, and every sea is covered with iron monsters ready to blow Christian brains into eternal froth.

Millions upon millions are annually expended in the effort to construct still more deadly and terrible engines of death. Industry is crippled, honest toil is robbed, and even beggary is taxed to defray the expenses of Christian murder. There must be some other way to reform this world. We have tried creed and dogma and fable, and they have failed—and they have failed in all the nations dead.

Nothing but education—scientific education can benefit mankind. We must find out the laws of nature and conform to them.

We Need Free Bodies and Free Minds.

free labor and free thought, chainless hands and fetterless brains. Free labor will give us wealth. Free thought will give us truth.

We need men with moral courage to speak and write their real thoughts, and to stand by their convictions, even to the very death. We need have no fear of being too radical. The future will verify all grand and brave predictions. Paine was splendidly in advance of his time, but he was orthodox compared to the infidels of to-day.

Science, the great iconoclast, has been very busy since 1809, and by the highway of progress are the broken images of the past. On every hand the people advance. The vicar of God has been pushed from the throne of the Cæsars and upon the roofs of the Eternal city falls once more the shadow of the eagle. All has been accomplished by the heroic few. The men of science have explored heaven and earth, and with infinite patience have furnished the facts. The brave thinkers have aided them. The gloomy caverns of superstition have been transformed into temples of thought, and the demons of the past are the angels of to-day.

Science took a handful of sand, constructed a telescope, and with it explored the starry depths of heaven. Science wrested from the gods their thunderbolts; and now, the electric spark freighted with thought and love flashes under all the waves of the sea. Science took a tear from the check of unpaid labor, converted it into steam, and created a giant that turns with tireless arm the countless wheels of toil.

Thomas Paine was one of the intellectual heroes, one of the men to whom we are indebted. His name is associated forever with the great republic. He lived a long, laborious, and useful life. The world is better for his having lived. For the sake of truth he accepted hatred and reproach for his portion. He ate the bitter bread of neglect and sorrow. His friends were untrue to him because he was true to himself and true to them. He lost the respect of what is called society, but kept his own. His life is what the world calls failure, and what history calls success.

If to love your fellow-men more than self is goodness, Thomas Paine was good. If to be in advance of your time, to be a pioneer in the direction of right, is greatness, Thomas Paine was great. If to avow your principles and discharge your duty in the presence of death is heroic, Thomas Paine was a hero.

At the age of seventy-three

Death Touched his Tired Heart.

He died in the land his genius defended, under the flag he gave to the skies. Slander cannot touch him now; hatred cannot reach him more. He sleeps in the sanctuary of the tomb, beneath the quiet of the stars.

A few more years, a few more brave men, a few more rays of light, and mankind will venerate the memory of him who said:

"Any system of religion that shocks the mind of a child cannot be a true system.

"The world is my country, and to do good my religion."

The next question is:

Did Thomas Paine Recant?

Mr. Paine had prophesied that fanatics would crawl and cringe around him during his last moments. He believed that they would put a lie in the mouth of death. When the shadow of the coming dissolution was upon him, two clergymen. Messrs. Milledollar and Cunningham, called to annoy the dying man. Mr. Cunningham had the politeness to say: "You have now a full view of death; you cannot live long; whoever does not believe in the Lord Jesus Christ will assuredly be damned." Mr. Paine replied: "Let me have none of your popish stuff. Get away with you. Good morning." On another occasion a Methodist minister obtruded himself, Mr. Willett Hicks was present. The minister declared to Mr. Paine that "unless he repented of his unbelief he would be damned." Paine, although at the door of death, rose in his bed and indignantly requested the clergyman to leave the room. On another occasion, two brothers by the name of Pigott sought to convert him. He was displeased and requested their departure. Afterward, Thomas Nixon and Captain Daniel Pelton visited him for the express purpose of ascertaining whether he had, in any manner, changed his religious opinions. They were assured by

the dying man that he still held the principles he had expressed in his writings.

Afterward, these gentlemen, hearing that William Cobbett was about to write a life of Paine, sent him the following note:

I must tell you now that it is of great importance to find out whether Paine recanted. If he recanted then the Bible is true—you can rest assured that a spring of water gushed out of a dead dry bone. If Paine recanted there is not the slightest doubt about that donkey making that speech to Mr. Baalam—not the slightest; and if Paine did not recant, then the whole thing is a mistake. I want to show that Thomas Paine died as he had lived, a friend of man and without superstition, and if you will stay here I will do it.

The Letter.

NEW YORK, April 24, 1818.—Sir: Having been informed that you have a design to write a history of the life and writings of Thomas Paine, if you have been furnished with materials in respect to his religious opinions, or rather of his recantation of his former opinions before his death, all you have heard of his recanting is false. Being aware that, such reports would be raised after his death by fanatics who infested his house at the time it was expected he would die, we, the subscribers, intimate acquaintances of Thomas Paine since the year 1776, went to his house. He was sitting up in a chair, and apparently in full vigor and use of all his mental faculties. We interrogated him upon his religious opinions, and if he had changed his mind, or repented of anything he had said or wrote on that subject. He answered, "Not at all," and appeared rather offended at our supposition that any change should take place in his mind. We took down in writing the questions put to him and his answers thereto, before a number of persons then in his room, among whom were his doctor, Mrs. Bonneville, &c. This paper is mislaid and cannot be found at present, but the above is the substance, which can be attested by many living witnesses.

THOMAS NIXON,
DANIEL PELTON.

An old man in Pennsylvania told me once that his father hired

An Old Revolutionary Soldier

by the name of Thomas Martin to work for him. Martin was then quite an old man and there was an old Presbyterian preacher used to come there, by the name of Crawford, and he sat down by the fire and he got to talking one night, among other things, about Thomas Paine—what a wretched, infamous dog he was; and while he was in the midst of this conversation the old soldier rose from the fireplace, and he walked over to this preacher, and he said to him: "Did you ever see Thomas Paine?" "No." "Well," he says, "I have. I saw him at Valley Forge. I heard read at the head of every regiment and company the letters of Thomas Paine. I heard them read the 'Crisis,' and I saw Thomas Paine writing on the head of a drum, witting at the bivouac fire, those simple words; that inspired every patriot's bosom, and I want to tell you, Mr. Preacher, that Thomas Paine did more for liberty than any priest that ever lived in this world."

And yet they say he was afraid to die! Afraid of what? Is there any God in heaven that

Hates a Patriot?

If there is, Thomas Paine ought to be afraid to die. Is there any God that would damn a man for helping to free three millions of people? If Thomas Paine was in hell tonight, and could get God's attention long enough to point him to the old banner of the stars floating over America, God would have to let him out. What would he be afraid of? Had he ever burned anybody? No. Had he put anybody in the inquisition? No. Ever put the thumb-screw on anybody? No. Ever put anybody in prison, so that some poor wife and mother would come and hold her little babe up at the grated window that the man bound to the floor might get one glimpse of his blue-eyed babe? Did he ever do that?

Did he ever light a faggot? Did he ever tear human flesh? Why, what had he to be afraid of? He had helped to make the world free. He had helped create the only republic then on the earth. What was he afraid of? Was God a tory? It won't do.

One would think from the persistence with which the orthodox have charged for the last seventy years that Thomas Paine recanted, that there must be some evidence of some kind to support those charges. Even with my ideas of the average honor of the believers in superstition, the average truthfulness of the disciples of fear, I did not believe that all those infamies rested solely upon poorly-attested alsehoods. I had charity enough to suppose that something had been said or done by Thomas Paine capable of being tortured into a foundation of all these calumnies. What Time had Thomas Paine committed that he should have feared to die? The only answer you can give is that he denied the inspiration of the Scriptures. If that is crime, the civilised world is tilled with

criminals. The pioneers of human thought, the intellectual leaders of this world, the foremost men in every science, the kings of literature and art, those who stand in the front of investigation, the men who are civilising and elevating and refining mankind,

Are All Unbelievers

in the ignorant dogma of inspiration. Why should we think that Thomas Paine was afraid to die? and why should the American people malign the memory of that great man? He was the first to advocate the separation from the mother country. He was the first to write these words: "The United States of America." Think of maligning that man! He was the first to lift his voice against human slavery, and while hundreds and thousands of ministers all over the United States not only believed in slavery, but bought and sold women and babes in the name of Jesus Christ, this infidel, this wretch who is now burning in the flames of hell, lifted his voice against human slavery and said: "It is robbery, and a slaveholder is a thief: the whipper of women is a barbarian; the seller of a child is a savage." No wonder that the thieving hypocrite of his day hated him?

I have no love for any man who ever pretended to own a human being. I have no love for a man who would sell a babe from the mother's throbbing, heaving, agonised breast. I have no respect for a man who considered a lash upon the naked back as a legal tender for labor performed. So write it down, Thomas Paine was

The First Great Abolitionist

of America.

Now let me tell you another thing. He was the first man to raise his voice for the abolition of the death penalty in the French convention. What more did he do? He was the first to suggest a federal constitution for the United States. He saw that the old articles of confederation were nothing; that they were ropes of water and chains of mist, and he said, "We want a federal constitution, so that when you pass a law raising 5 per cent you can make the States pay it," Let us give him his due. What were all these preachers doing at that time?

He hated superstition; he loved the truth. He hated tyranny; he loved liberty. He was the friend of the human race. He lived a brave and thoughtful life. He was a good and true and a generous man, and he died as he lived. Like a great and peaceful river with green and shaded banks, without a murmur, without a ripple, he flowed into the waveless ocean of eternal peace. I love him; I love every man who gave me, or helped to give me the liberty I enjoy to-night; I love every man who helped put our flag in heaven. I love every man who has lifted his voice in any age for liberty, for a chainless body and a fetterless brain. I love every man who has given to every other human being every right that he claimed for himself. I love every man who has thought more of principle than he has of position. I love the men who have trampled crowns beneath their feet that they might do something for mankind, and for that reason I love Thomas Paine.

I thank you all, ladies and gentlemen, every one,—every one, for the attention you have given me this evening.

A Farmer's Reasons for Not being a Free-Thinker. Price—Fourpence. Ashburton: Printed at "The Guardian" Office West Street, 1881.

Introduction.

A strong desire to benefit those classes of persons who are generally pretty numerous in communities where more than an average amount of worldly ambition and enterprise is combined with a certain amount of intelligence—and where also unfortunately Christian lukewarmness is only too apparent, a desire, I say, to do all in my power for these has led me to write this short pamphlet. Those I chiefly refer to are generally called "honest doubters," men who evidently are exercised in their thoughts on that all-important matter—their relations to their Creator, but who, I am sure, are generally deceived in two ways. They attempt to settle by "reason" alone those things which *it* cannot do, but which *its* simple function is to point to that way by which, to any one in real earnest, alone can certainty and happiness be ensured. They also judge Christianity, not for what it is in itself and what it will do for them personally, but from what any one who chooses to call himself a Christian lowers it to, or tries to—they often unwisely conclude that all church and chapel-goers are Christians, and judge Christianity accordingly. If a man represents himself as a perfect arithmetician and we find out that he is ignorant of the multiplication table, do we condemn arithmetic? Because colonial surveys are frequently incorrect (*always* more or less so) do we conclude that measuring on trigonometrical principles is fallacious? So, even true Christians are but *men*, while nominal Christians, who are often regular churchgoers, no more belong to Christ than does the most violent infidel.

To that other, and also numerous class of men whose intelligence leads them, while admitting a Creator, to stoutly contend for the rights of the *created* to lay down what their duty is to that Creator, and regard as a gross absurdity the notion of the Creator's having the right to do so (because a school is solely for the children's benefit the *children* naturally should dictate what the master should teach them or not teach them!), to that class I can only say that they need not think for one moment that I am fool enough to suppose that anything I can write or prove will in the slightest degree change their opinions. They meet in a club perhaps, and by cast-iron *arguments* prove Christianity a myth, and yet perhaps the same men another evening when seated comfortably in the midst of their own families would admit (if they are open to admit anything) that there are some things which while *far more essential* to human happiness than *polemics* are still scarcely fit for, or even open to discussion, much less to be strictly defined and settled by any *intellectual* controversy. If such is the case with the human affections, a hundred times more so is it with the Divine affections, which just as surely exist, but which are not drawn forth until we *know* and *have* God, any more than the human affections appear till there is a wife or child to bring them forth.

However, as the preface is already out of all proportion (but somehow I never did care much for *tape*, especially when of a *red* color!) to the subject itself, I will finish by saying that I have changed both *tense* and *person* several times, for I like liberty, and it also enables me to write plainly throughout.

A Farmer's Reasons for Not being a Free-Thinker.

In writing the following, I am aware that I shall be laying myself open to criticism in one or two ways. I may be charged with egotism, and also with being ridiculously frank; but as my sole object is the good of others, I do not hesitate to expose myself to these charges, all experience showing that he who allows personal considerations to sway him never benefits his fellows much, either in this world or the next—the everlasting one. And I would like the men of this world, and the unbelievers generally, to give the following their close attention so that they may either profit by it or refute it. (This includes some part of a reply to a free-thinker, the modern name for unbeliever, who, amongst other things, had asserted that faith was a physiological impossibility with many—this will, therefore, have a reference to "Faith.")

I (the writer) am a young farmer. I am considered sensible, and up to the general average of men in point of intelligence and education. I have done pretty well in farming, having a natural liking for it. Politically, I am a radical, a firm believer in Liberalism, with a strong idea that a leading trait of true Liberalism is a perfect readiness to treat opponents *liberally*, and to support *all* Liberal legislation, whether it proceeds from friends or opponents—he who is not liberal to his opponents is no Liberal, for his politics are founded more on passion and feeling than on calm reason. As regards private character, I do not spend money on, nor trouble myself about, smoking, drinking, women, or theatre-going and never did care about them—and I am in good health. Also, I believe pretty firmly in the notion that he who buys twenty shillings' worth of goods owes, and always will owe, twenty shilling for them till they are either paid for or the creditor voluntarily forgives the debt—legalised compromises for commercial expediency notwithstanding. In fact, I suppose that if the delusion of some persons, to the effect that if a man be upright and moral here, he has nothing to fear hereafter, be true then, I have not a great deal to be afraid of. As I said above, I have written this so that readers can judge, from my opinions and ideas on general things, as to what value they may fairly place on my convictions on that most important of matters—religion. So far as Christianity is concerned, there are but two classes in the world—believers and unbelievers. Being a living and responsible creature, I find myself called on to decide on that most vital of questions—my own destiny—or, rather, to decide on that *alternative* portion of my destiny which it is left to me to settle, or become elect to. One class, the believers, tells me there is a God; that He has given His Word to the world; that my heart is naturally evil; that this Word affirms it; that God has dealt with this evil *once* for all in *one way*, which way we are commanded to take advantage of, or take the consequences, which are eternal—way. I am told, that there is an Evil Influence or Spirit continually working within me against my own eternal interests, and I am, therefore warned against it. But the unbelievers ask me to doubt these things; to regard them as improbable, some few treating them with ridicule and scorn. They ask me to regard it as absurd, that men are naturally inclined to evil, and point to the present state of civilisation in confirmation thereof. So, being endowed with reason, and, therefore, responsibility, I look and judge for myself, bearing in mind that it is the *heart* of man only that God deals with, and which He has determined shall be changed or punished, and, also, keeping in mind that I myself, if inclined to evil, cannot see the real extent or nature of evil. Taking this colony, which has had from its commencement every advantage possible in this world, I find that there are *thousands* of laws passed to prevent men from insulting, injuring, defrauding,

stealing, or murdering each other. I find that the stoutest men in the community are engaged and paid to devote all their time to the enforcing of these laws, but that in spite of this, the newspapers teem daily with accounts of outrages, robberies, etc. I find that the colony sends all its wisest and most experienced men to meet together annually for a considerable time solely to make and amend these laws for keeping men in order (and I find that a great portion of this time is spent in their keeping *themselves* in order, or trying to). I find that men are naturally inclined to run each other down rather than to praise each other. I find that although men believe in God, the majority think it a matter of extreme wonder, if not ridicule, when a man praises God publicly, or ever says anything at all about God in earnest during ordinary conversation, whilst the hearing of a senseless and vulgar comic song is regarded as natural and enlivening. Thinking over these things, I ask, if every one of the hundreds of legal and social restraints, now imposed as an absolute necessity of civilisation, were removed, would things alter for the better or the worse? The question is obviously absurd. *Then the heart of man, left unrestrained is naturally inclined to evil*, and God looks at and deals only with the heart. I ask, would not these very men who disbelieve this think me mad if I were to propose one law to prevent men from doing too much good to each other. I would be thought mad, and yet the very seeming absurdity of the proposal is a terrible proof of the depths to which the *heart* of man is sunk. I find that looking at things calmly and without bias, I am compelled to admit that a wise choice must incline one to side with the *believers*. This is how the matter stands—unbelievers ask me to *doubt* these things, to look on them as *improbable*; but are utterly unable to give or show me anything which will prove them *absolutely impossible*; whereas, believers tell me they are quite sure of the truth of them, and will point me out the means whereby I also may become absolutely certain of their truth. Now, if a man has, say, to pass along a certain track in the night, and he is told by some that certain parts are dangerous in the dark, whilst others tell him this is improbable, he, if wise, will take a lantern to see and provide against the worst—a fool only would pass on unconcerned. And what measure of folly is it, in a matter of eternal concern, to regard as improbable that which admits of a sure proof of its own. Now, I *was* an unbeliever. If I heard what I *fancied* was a forcible argument against eternal punishment, or if I heard that there were so many freethinkers in such a country, or especially if I heard any case of Christian inconsistency, I felt an inward satisfaction. And yet, underneath all this, there was a certain uneasiness—ill—defined, but as real as that satisfaction. I felt this uneasiness because I was *in doubt* on a matter of deep personal concern. As a being of reason, I knew that so long as doubt existed, uneasiness also must exist. If doubt remains, and uneasiness disappears, then true reason has disappeared also (when I say true reason, I mean human judgment uninfluenced by evil, or, more correctly, the Divinely-implanted strivings of the soul for a real and eternal Knowledge of its Creator). Reason, therefore, told me that this uneasiness could not be ever entirely thrown off; in short, it told me that if Christianity were one hundred times more unlikely than I wished or thought it to be, still the consequences were so utterly immeasurable that it would not do merely to *doubt* it, I must be absolutely certain about it. I considered that a rational being *must* be allowing *something else* than reason to influence him if he does not do everything in his power to settle a doubtful but all-momentous matter. It must be settled one way or another—whichever way it admitted of proof, precisely as would be done in a secular matter. And as unbelievers were quite unable to *prove* anything on their side, it was necessary to try the believers' way of proving the truth (more correctly, to *yield* to those strivings of the soul for liberty). Now, I had thrown over (nominal) religion wholly and deliberately for years, as I had received no real benefit from it, and I was determined there should be no luke-warmness or hypocrisy about me. I had kept away from all churches and chapels for years; but acting *now* on *true* reason, I read the Word of God—the Gospels especially—and a few evangelical publications. I was a "hard nail" at the time, but when I came to, read, and think of Christ, and had offered up a word or two in prayer, in spite of myself almost, I became greatly affected. When out at work for days I could not let Christ and His work of atonement into my thoughts for a minute without tears coming into my eyes from involuntary emotion. Yet, I had often lead the same thing before, years ago, without seeing anything particular in them as regarded myself. That was because I read them either as a formal duty, or from well-meaning curiosity, whereas now I was searching for the truth—the vital truth of Christianity. Thus, directly I went to God's Word in earnest, God, true to His name and promise, softened my heart almost in spite of myself. If Christianity were false I would have felt the same, even if not more indifferent, than when I first read the Bible, for I had become far harder in heart. But although affected thus, I was still full of doubt and uncertainty until I saw that I must throw myself, with all my doubts, inward hatreds, blasphemies, and all other sins, entirely on to God's mercy. I did so; and after a moment's struggle, during which all the powers for good and evil seemed to focus all their energies in a fight of one moment's duration, the atonement of Christ proved itself all-triumphant, as it has done in *every* one of all the millions of cases where it has been sought for in earnest. In itself, this is a simple thing. Christ has already put away all sin, on condition each one believes and accepts His work as his complete justification, thereby practically acknowledging one's utter inability to save oneself, and also becoming obedient to the will of God, by the help of God; but there is such an overwhelming disinclination naturally in man to do this, that without Divine help it never would be done. That *uneasiness*

which exists more or less in all unbelievers is the outcome of those promptings of the Spirit to search for the "truth." Directly after I had thus given my soul into Christ's keeping I walked out and thought to myself, "Well, I would sooner have both my hands and feet cut off and lose my farm than give up what I *know now*. I had, years before, thought it impossible to *believe*; I had no faith, and it was because of this that I *felt* it very *hard*, and so *turned hard* and threw over religion altogether. But I was blind, and stumbled over a full, free, and ever-ready salvation, And I deserved to stumble, because, though I could take lots of men at their word, I could not take God at *His* as to my salvation, being already completed. Simple—awful—infinite! And, now, my unbelieving and (so-called) free-thinking readers, allow me to tell you that I am not a fool—at least, I rather guess I'm not. I am just as sensible as ever I was in other respects, but those things which reason cannot decide reason has led me to leave entirely in the guidance of Him that thus limited my reason. I still render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and I think it *advantageous* to do so in *this world*, but *now*, also, I render unto God the things that are God's, thinking it equally advantageous to do so, both in this world and the next, when the restitution of all things will be made. As I have said before, I have a right to be considered fairly intelligent and sensible; and there are and have been *millions* of cases more or less resembling mine all over the world. I ask you, reader, if you are an unbeliever how do you explain this case of mine? If God's Word—if Christianity be false, you cannot account for it, unless *everything* that usually is supposed to prove men sane, in my case proves me insane. But if Christianity be true, everything is easily and naturally accounted for. I ask you, as a being endowed with calm reasoning faculties, whether you can afford to exclude my case from consideration? not to mention others. A rational man, in passing judgment on any question, gives *due* weight to *every one* thing relative thereto. But if you do believe that Christianity is false, or, at least, doubtful, and that my case is simply a gross delusion founded on a gross delusion, you commit yourself distinctly in one, if not two, ways (freethinkers generally hold that faith is an impossibility with many persons). Whether you believe or not, you will allow that Christianity is a remarkable thing. You can believe that a rational person can, after deliberately taking the only sensible course by which to prove Christianity true or false, grossly deceive himself by believing in a great deception, in which, also, multitudes of the best men in the—world believe. Well, if you have sufficient faith as to believe this and to believe these things are unworthy of consideration, you have a wonderful *faith*—a faith one-tenth of which, under the guidance of God's Word, would save your soul eternally; a faith which is far greater than I ever had, for it has overcome your calm reason. Again, if you believe that I, having everything to prove me fairly reasonable and intelligent, and coming up to the general average in all those attributes which are generally supposed to argue a man's rationality or sense, am nevertheless grossly and thoroughly self-deceived, you but prove and believe that an ordinarily sensible person is liable to greatly impose upon himself, and if this is possible with me, why not with you? Granted an equality in intelligence, etc., who is to say I am deceived and you are not? Human judgment cannot decide it, because we have here the very soundness of human judgment in question, and human judgment in one of us is so terribly mistaken as to shake confidence in it altogether, we being *living examples* of its fallibility. *Man cannot decide this question, and if it were not that I, recognising this, threw myself on God's hands to decide it for me, I should be one with you in this matter, because I could never have differed from you.* This is the kernel of the whole matter. I sought the *truth*, and God made me a believer; I did not make myself a believer. Now, it is no use bringing "arguments" to me and asking explanations of this and that, because I have experienced a good many of these free-thought fallacies myself. I have done more thinking than reading, and I know and am sure that free-thought, if it were not so disastrous in its *consequences*, would be ridiculous. I know what a tremendous struggle it is to let *true reason* have full sway, be the the consequences what they may as regards the sneers and scoffing of others. You *doubt* Christianity; I am *certain* it is true. I challenge you, or any other unbeliever, to discuss this question *from the heart* I have thrown open to you my most inmost thoughts. If you are not willing to express openly also your heartfelt convictions and to show thus your willingness practically to sacrifice all in the search for the truth, does not this fact itself show you that I have a *conscious advantage* over you in thus being able freely to expose my thoughts when it is of no benefit to me, but for your profit that I do it? I know this, that if you do as I did you will never be able to thank God enough for what He has done, from now to all eternity. Man's destiny, simply illustrated, is like a house with two rooms and a cellar. You are born in one room, and you have a certain time in which to stay in it. There is a door in it leading into the next room, where you can stay *peacefully for ever*, and you are both commanded and invited to enter it. When your time comes, if you have refused to enter that room, you cannot stay any longer in the first room, so you must be put in the cellar, as the only remaining place, *without peace for ever*. God has chosen to bring you into this world, and he has chosen to prepare for you an everlasting world or state of happiness and glory. But He has left you with the power of free choice in this as in all other matters, at the same time *commanding* and *inviting* you to accept it, it being without money and without price, and can be accepted instantaneously, Goa himself having met *everything* that Divine Justice necessitated meeting. But if you will deliberately refuse to obey God in this matter, rejecting everlasting salva- tion, you must exist for ever in the only and Divinely-just alternative—hell.

Unbelievers, at death, will be cut wholly and for ever from the presence of God, in which presence every desire of rectified human nature finds its fulfilment, and outside of which presence depraved human nature, freed from all earthly restraints, finds itself, and *is in itself* all that is undesirable. But *you* cannot enter this condition without breaking God's commandment, and wilfully smothering those convictions of conscience which God also implanted within us to guide us to the truth. "The Lord is not willing that *any* should perish, but that *all* should come to eternal life."

There is a lamentable misapprehension of facts, or rather of the appearance that things wear at the present time as to Christianity. Some (so-called) "freethinkers" seem to have an idea that "free-thought" is advancing at the cost of Christianity. As to *true* Christianity, the very reverse is the case. But this is true: in past times people were either believers or else persons who treated Christianity with ignorant indifference, they merely *did not believe*. Now these people, and all others, are becoming educated. Education will make a person think, but it will not make him a Christian. If Christianity were merely a question of education or intellect, it would amount to this—that all the clever people would get to heaven. But Christianity is the only equal and fair thing in this world. The conditions of it involve fairness to all alike. To return—Education will compel men, if unbelievers, not only to disbelieve, but to find reasons and arguments for disbelieving, and it would be strange indeed if Satan were non-plussed for the first time in this world as regards giving his servants an excuse, no matter how intellectual his servants are become. Satan has found it necessary, in order to keep up with the times, to take away his old label "unbeliever" and replace it with the far more enticing and dignified one of "Freethinker." The *nominal* Christian is a free-thinker when he thinks at all, and if he changed his name a hundred times he is no loss to Christ, for he never belonged to Him. True Christianity is spreading all over the world, but there will be unbelievers also as long as this dispensation lasts. But I know this—that the true Christian is the only *free—thinker*, properly speaking. I have seen something of *both sides* and I think I know, therefore. I am aware that I am a great coward! I have not pluck enough to enable me to treat God with indifference, even in this world; and if the free-thinkers can manage to treat Him with the same indifference in the next world as they do in this, I shall acknowledge that they are wise as well as plucky, but till then, and knowing the reverse will actually be the case, I think they are very, very unwise. Their first exclamation after death will probably be one of horror and surprise at their folly in not taking the trouble to look at both sides of the question, asking the help of God also, while on earth, and for not foreseeing that God would satisfactorily explain all those things which puzzled their intellects, but which, even if explained on earth, would not have proved of any spiritual benefit to them. There will be gnashing of teeth at their unaccountable blindness in not seeking *salvation* for their *souls*, before they sought for more *knowledge* for their *minds* than was necessary. And still I believe that it is with them, as it was with me, more *blindness* than absolute *foolishness*, though it is hard to draw much distinction between the two in a rational being, wilful blindness being folly, when by simply asking God to remove it, they can *see* spiritually at once. I earnestly hope and pray that the reader of this, if an unbeliever, will not persist in the vain endeavor to settle this question of eternity in his own mind, but that he will *earnestly* ask God's assistance, which costs nothing and *need* not occupy one minute, but immediately *settles all things for ail time*, besides opening the understanding to a surprising degree, thereby simplifying the seeming confusion of this world in respect to the *actual* "truth" to a degree which no amount of study and no depth of intellect can possibly attain to. Man alone never did, and never will decide this matter, for this simple reason—there are *physical, intellectual, and spiritual* faculties in man, each distinct from the others, and it is no more possible to decide the spiritual by the intellect than it is to settle the intellectual by the physical. *When* it is possible to settle an intellectual controversy by physical strength or force, *then* will it also be possible to settle things spiritual by the agency of the intellect, *but not till then*. Spiritual things are the things of God, and by His help alone can the "truth" be known; the first and only use that can be made of the spiritual faculties is that of *prayer*, an earnest seeking for the "truth," which only the spirit of God can reveal.

"There is a way which *seemeth right* unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death." . . . "And for this cause (for rejecting the Gospel of Christ) God sendeth them a working of error (or strong delusion) that they should believe a lie."

That the end for which I have written this may be more surely and profitably attained, I wish all "believers" who read this to ask God to use it as the means of bringing some from darkness into light. "Let him know that he which converteth a sinner from the error of his ways shall save a soul from death, and shall cover a multitude of sins."

I think it desirable to say, in reference to that portion of the foregoing which deals with the "unbelievers" inability to prove *absolutely* their side, and the rational necessity, therefore, for trying the "believers" side, that I wrote in that way to be the more easily understood by the natural man—the unbelievers; being well aware that it is not the Scriptural or Christian manner of putting in, which is more correctly expressed as the turning from the ways of evil to the ways of God, Who quickens us from spiritual death into *life*.

As I said before, I am young and healthy, so it is not the near approach of death *that can be said* to cause

me to "turn religious." Also, I have done well as far as I have gone in life, so it cannot be said that it was disgust or disappointment *with this world's usage of me* which brought the change.

In conclusion, if anyone thinks of writing to me, I hope he will do so as I shall be glad to devote *all my time* to replying to those who are really desirous of knowing the *actual truth* of this matter, apart from what man would *like it to be*.

Address—"FARMER," Post Office, Ashburton.

God makes a *free offer to everyone* of the *highest possible* happiness (infinite joy) for the longest possible period—eternity. Reader, *can you ask for more? will you ask for less.?*

vignette

Printed at the Guardian Office.

National Secular Society's Tracts.—No. 11.

The Atheist's Creed.

WE believe in one all-embracing universe, not made by hands nor gods; in one grand totality of existence, that was, and is, and (for aught that we can imagine to the contrary) ever shall be; in infinitely varied Nature, whereof all worlds and we are part.

But we believe especially in Man, her noblest offspring our common brother, our joy, and hope, and love, and trust. For as we know he has risen from the lowest forms of life, and from barbarism, so we do know and believe that he can rise, does rise, and will rise higher and higher in knowledge, wisdom, goodness, and happiness while brave and honest men, true lovers of their kind, lead onward; and so the heart-rending sum total of human misery shall be diminished year by year, and men shall happier, nobler be; in which sure and certain hope we work without ceasing, and are filled with earnest strength and joy, that no persecution, nor slander, nor suffering can take away. For man, our brother, suffered under superstition, and was dead and buried in dense ignorance; he descended to belief in hell, and to manifold other delusions, infamies, and miseries; but he has nevertheless ascended into civilisation, and will yet ascend in true manhood, just and fearless, wise and loving, to brotherly co-operation, world-wise, glad, and glorious.

We believe in nature's laws, sternly unforgiving to those who would ignore and break them, but kindly and full of blessing to those who study and obey. We believe in the holiness, the moral and physical healthiness of work and of play. We believe in the Communion of Man; the punishment of sins; the active immortality of all good actions, words, and thoughts, which are indeed "twice blessed," blessing "him that, gives and him that take." We believe most solemnly in duty as the ruling principle of life and conduct, and in love, honor, respect, and reverence, which we, for all men's sake, will make its additional reward and stimulus. We believe intensely in honesty and justice, and in the ceaseless pursuit of truth and wisdom, the ceaseless strife, with falsehood and folly. We believe in the education of all men in the purest and loftiest morality and emotion built on the rock of fact and reason, and not on mere drift-sands of barbarous tradition, not on legendary miracles fast becoming incredible to all thoughtful men. We believe in the substitution of naturalism for supernaturalism, i.e., in the careful replacement of belief by knowledge, of tradition by science, of faith by reason, of godly fear by human love, of blind superstition by intelligent morality, of idle prayer and unneeded worship by thoughtful study and earnest work for human beings, until religion, that mischievous and all-absorbing delusion, perverting and wasting untold human effort and ever bringing forth fiercely obstructive broods of blind unreasoning prejudice, hatred, cruelty, and crime, shall be as powerless to stay the progress of mankind as already are the closely allied beliefs in witchcraft, demonology, ghosts, trial by ordeal, astrology, magic, &c. We believe in the moral innocence of disbelieving a lie, and in the moral guilt of unenquiring credulity. We believe in right, though a hell of eternal torture were its penalty, and we know that wrong, injustice, cruelty, and fraud should be hated and rejected, though an omnipotence commanded, or an eternity of bliss rewarded.

We believe in schools and libraries, in savings' banks and lecture halls, in books and newspapers, in music and poetry, in temperance and cleanliness, both moral and physical, in industry, in good temper, in the cheerful and rational enjoyment of life's duties and pleasures, in happy homes as the ultimate goal of all human endeavors.

We believe in science, in brave, patient, toiling science, whose precious discoveries and teachings enable us to govern nature by obeying her. We accept the deep lessons of history; we believe in freedom of person, of trade, of speech, of pen, of thought; in self-government (beginning at home in each individual), in progress, personal, national, Universal; in arbitration as the only wise and just substitute for the crimes and horrors of

war, and in the widest patriotism, knowing no distinction of race nor color.

W. P. BALL.

This Tract, together with nine others issued by the Society, can be obtained for distribution from the Secretary, Mr. R. FORDER, 33, Aldeney Road, Mile End, London, E., in assorted packets, at 6d. per 100, post free 7½d. Principles, Rules, and Objects of the Society sent on receipt of a stamped envelope.

A Letter to Robert Stout, *Esq.*, Solicitor, On the Tract Called "Eyeopener, No. 5."

SIR,—I take the liberty of addressing you publicly by letter. My reason for so doing is that last week I received per post enclosed in an envelope a tract, purporting to be a reprint from the 'Dunedin Echo,' and titled "Eyeopener, No. 5." To whom I am indebted for this honour I am unaware, therefore I am unable to make my acknowledgements. Understanding that you are principal proprietor of the 'Dunedin Echo,' and if not sole Editor, conjointly responsible for the matter appearing in that journal, I thought you would not take it amiss if I conveyed to you my public acknowledgements—as if you were the author and person who sent it—for the interest you appear to take in my welfare; and at the same time make a few notes and comments upon that tract which, perhaps, you may in the interest of *Free Thought* publish in your journal. I suppose you to be in some measure acquainted with the Scriptures; you are perfectly aware that when Peter used those words, "I perceive God is no respecter of persons,"—Acts x, 34-35, that it was in reference to the spiritual blessing, commonly termed conversion, that had just been imparted to Cornelius the Centurian. You know that the Apostle followed by saying, "But in every nation he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness is accepted of Him." I think you will admit, with the clear and lucid mind for which you are credited, that this is an admirable connection, and worthy of Infinite perfection. But you may not be aware that Peter, in common with the rest of the Jewish nation, held doctrines prejudicial to the Gentiles, which, though taught them by tradition, were utterly contrary to the tenor of their Scriptures. I refer you to Exodus, xii., 48-49: "And when a stranger shall sojourn with you, and will keep the passover to the Lord, let all his males be circumcised, then let him come and keep it, and he shall be as one born in the land." "One law shall be to him that is home born and him that sojourneth among you." I think you will candidly admit that there is no contradiction that under the polity of the Israelites, as under the polity of the Christians, God only required submission to certain conditions to show he is no respecter of persons. But the case on which you appear to rest most conclusively for proof that the Bible is contradictory and God is shown to be a respecter of persons, is Esau *versus* Jacob. I cannot understand how your legal mind could think this to be a case in point. I understand it to have reference to a certain temporal work that God, the supreme judge of the eternal fitness of things, choose Jacob as the most fitted to accomplish. I am neither a Hebrew, Greek, or Latin scholar, therefore I shall not attempt to put any other interpretation upon Malichi, i. 3, than you have put upon it; but it might be worth your while as a searcher for truth who may be acquainted with these languages, to search and see whether some milder interpretation could not be put upon those words, "Esau have I hated." At all events, whatever may be said about that particular passage, you ought to be perfectly aware that God's dealings with Esau, personally and representatively, up to a very late date show no manifestation of this hatred, for long before Jacob attained to eminence other than a pastoral prince, Esau met him with 400 men equipped for war—Genesis, xxxii. 6. Three hundred years after Moses gives us a chapter of the generation of Esau (Genesis, xxxvi.) which conclusively proves that while Israel was in its infancy as a nation the Edomites, children of Esau, had grown to be a well organised and powerful nation. And this prosperity, with intervals of vicissitudes common to nations at that time, such as subjection to the Israelites, grew till 587 years before Christ, when, as we read in the prophecy of Obadiah, they attained the height of perfection as a nation, while the tribes of Israel had been in captivity more than 100 years, and Judah was just gone into captivity in Babylon. Most people gauging blessing by power and prosperity would have said whatever prosperity a father's blessing may carry in the future Esau had certainly had the best of it up to this time, and there is not a shadow of proof from this case that God is a respecter of persons. Your next contention is that because God called the Israelites to the work of exterminating the seven nations of the Caananites he is a respecter of persons. You appear to ignore the fact that it was a judicial arrangement. If God, the creator and supreme judge of man be admitted; his right to sit in judgment upon nations must be admitted; and if he arrive at the decision that a nation is so corrupt that the earth loathes them, and in the interest of humanity they ought to be swept from the face of the earth, he has certainly the right to appoint the means to carry his decrees into execution. In the case of Sodom and Gomorrah it was fire and brimstone, probably a volcano; in this case he appoints the Israelites. Can we question his right to do so? Your judicial mind unprejudiced must certainly say no. You are doubtless aware that there is a natural law by which the decline and fall of nations is produced. It is

seen at work in ancient Greece, corruption and luxuriousness produced effeminacy, and they became a prey to the more rude and less vicious Romans. The Romans in their turn become corrupt, luxurious, and effeminate, and in turn they became a prey to the less vicious and more hardy Huns, Vandals, and Goths. These are only illustrations of what has been, what will be, as sure as the law of cause and effect, while the present state of things lasts. You ask, does God ever become fatigued? does he ever repent? I confess I am surprised at seeing such questions in print endorsed by an acute lawyer. Suppose you were counsel for a Chinaman just from the Flowery Land who could not understand a word of English; would you attempt to communicate with him in English? Certainly not; you would, through an interpreter, communicate with him in his own language. (Just so God communicates to man in the language he understands.) "God is not a man that he should repent," expresses the firmness of his purpose. "He repented that he had made man," expresses his thoughts of the enormity of man's iniquity. In no sense can it be looked upon as contradictory. You state the Bible teaches an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth (Exodus xxi., 24). You do not appear to know—as a lawyer interested in ancient law records you ought—that this was a part of the law given by Moses for the use of those who administer justice. It is quite true it was misinterpreted in that day to mean the right to personal revenge. It was this spirit which Jesus of Nazareth rebuked when he said, resist not evil, &c. (Matthew v., 39). You mention strong drink (Deuteronomy xiv., 26, and Proverbs xxi.) as contradictory. Do you remember the distance of time between Deuteronomy and Proverbs? There is some reason to think at the later period drunkenness had become a national sin, hence it was denounced. Have you not read that Abraham planted a grove in Beersheba and called on the name of the everlasting God (Genesis xxi., 33). Yet 400 years after the Children of Israel were forbidden to plant groves of any trees near the altar of the Lord their God (Deuteronomy xvi., 21). Why was this? Because it had become the scene of the licentious worship of the surrounding nations, and hence its condemnation. You have made many more statements which you class as contradictions, such as God is angry, answered by the Chinese illustration; Take no thought for to-morrow, which has always been understood as anxious thought (Matthew vi., 17); Lay not up treasures (Matthew vi., 34), which has always been supposed to be a warning against the unprofitable custom of burying the treasure in earthen vessels, for the very same mouth that spake this commended the man who had the five talents and traded with them (Matthew xxv., 15 to 22). Not one of those are thought of by Bible students as contradictions, and how you could ever let them appear in your paper as such is past my comprehension. You finish by stating that to believe the Bible is to believe what no sane men could believe—rather strong language you will admit, seeing that you are encompassed about in New Zealand with so many people professedly guilty of this insanity. For twenty years I have been guilty of this insanity, and the more I read of it the stronger my faith, *i.e.* insanity, becomes. It has been of some comfort to me during this period. It has kept me from doing many things that I am sure would have been injurious to my body. It has incited me to do actions that have given me some happiness in the doing. It has given me a hope that cheers me as I pass on my journey, that the end of this life will introduce me into a nobler and better one. You think I am deceived; suppose I am, it is a deception that does me good and not harm; would you seriously advise me to give it up? Can you give me something that will answer the same purpose? I have an intimate friend that believes with me, and every Sunday afternoon he attends the poor house; around the table are seated a few old people, ranging from 75 to 86; they smile at the sight of my friend; he sings with them, he prays with them, he reads with them, and expounds the Bible to the best of his ability to them; they appear pleased; he has evidently made them happy for the time; my friend is happy because he has made them happy. Now supposing the Bible is not true, and there is no God, no hereafter, no heaven, and all this happiness is, as your friend C. Bright would say, but the reflex effect of faith, it does them good, it throws a little sunshine of happiness upon their downward path. Could you honestly advise my friend to give it up, or can you point out something that would answer the purpose of imparting mutual happiness to these old people and my friend? (Do not think that this is penned by a clergyman, or you may think it is because his craft is in danger. These hands work for my necessities, and I am as Mark Antony said, but a plain, blunt man.) My friend knelt by the bedside of an old lady of 79; she was about to die; she (according to you vainly) imagined she was going to a place called heaven; she passed away cheered and happy with this thought; she left an husband behind; he (according to you vainly) imagines he shall soon join her; it cheers and makes him happy; would you advise my friend to undeceive him? There is an old man of 86; he has not a single friend in New Zealand; it is misfortune only that he is poor; he believes he has a friend above; he knows his sands of life are well nigh run out; he believes through the atonement of the Saviour he will soon be where there is fulness of joy and pleasures for evermore. Would you be prepared to suggest to my friend the desirability of telling him he is only deceiving himself? I could go on multiplying these cases, but I think they will suffice.

I am, yours &c.,
N.P.J.
Nelson,

Printed and published by BOND, FINNEY, & Co., Printers, Nelson.

Bennet's Prayer to the Devil.

Secular Tract.

Canterbury Freethought Association

OH LUCIFER, thou Son of the Morning, Prince of the Air; thou Sulphureous Majesty known also as Beelzebub, Apollyon, Satan, the Power of Darkness, the Evil One, and Monarch of the nether regions; we would address ourselves to thee. We know not when[*unclear: ce*] thou art nor whither thou goest; and in an under-tone we would say, we seriously doubt thy existence as a personage; but having heard much of thee, we would approach thee respectfully. As much as is thought to be understood of thee, as many as think they have been annoyed by thy presence, little or nothing is absolutely known of thee. Thou art said to have a frightful visage, with horns on thy head, a cloven foot and a long barbed tail, but there is not a being alive who hath ever seen thee, and the word of those who, in former times claimed to have had a glimpse of thy person, is not worthy of credit.

He who hath told us most of thee, giving us thy early history and exploits, was John surnamed Milton. He described thy tall, majestic form and thy imposing presence. He narrated most eloquently, and in sublime verse, thy prowess and valor in thy terrible contest with the King of Heaven, and his superior forces commanded by his Lieutenant-General Michael, in which grand contest rocks and mountains and thunderbolts were fiercely hurled, and luckily no one killed. If it was thy unfortunate fate to be beaten in that bloodless conflict and to lose a subordinate position in Heaven, thou hast ever since been the victor, and has ruled solely, in Hell, and without successful opposition on earth. Howbeit, John was a poet and dwelt so completely in an imaginary world, that his descriptions of thee must be viewed in that light, though they have been the basis of the theological views, concerning thee.

The class of men called priests have much to say of thee, and claim to have derived great information concerning thee from an old book written by unknown persons and which itself sadly needs confirmation.

From all that we can learn of thee, by this record, and what its expounders say of thee, thou hast been greatly slandered and maligned. Thou art called a liar, the father of liars, the source of all evil and the cause of all the trouble and unhappiness the world has known. We believe this unjust and unfounded. In that "snake story," when thou persuadest our first mother to eat a fine apple thy antagonist had created, it is held thou didst act very badly, but we cannot see wherein; the fruit did open her eyes and the eyes of her husband, to know good and evil, and when thou saidst to her in the day they ate thereof, they should not surely die, thou toldest no lie, but the truth, for they lived nine hundred years thereafter. If it was wrong for thee to induce them to partake of such beautiful fruit that was within their reach, was it not more wrong to *create* such a dangerous temptation and place it in their sight?

In that friendly tilt thou hadst with thy competitor, the Son, otherwise known as the carpenter of Nazareth, and who said that he and the father were one, when thou carriedest him to the top of a mountain so exceedingly high, that thou couldst show him all the kingdoms of the earth, including not only those on the side towards thee, but those on the opposite side as well;

QUERY.—How tall a mountain would it require in our country, to enable a man to get a good view of Egypt, India, China, and Australia?

and when thou takedest him to the pinnacle of the temple to show him the surrounding country, thou at least proved thy superior physical power, and if thou offeredest him all the kingdoms of the earth for a certain consideration, tho' thy enemies would disparage thee for this, and say thou didst not own them, it would seem thou didst, by the right of conquest; and that at all events, thou hadst the right to execute a quitclaim deed if thou choscest.

That little affair with Job, when thou afflictedest him so sadly and covered him with boils, was really a little shabby, and, most assuredly, an act no gentlemanly devil would want to be guilty of, but it seems it was a special arrangement which thou enteredest into with thy antagonist, as a matter of experiment, and if thou were culpable, he certainly was no less so, for it was he that first named Job to thee. In fact it was a discreditable piece of business for both thee and him.

Though the little experiment here alluded to was not worthy, a great being, justice impels us to say that for

many centuries thereafter thou wast not known to be guilty of any reprehensible act, whilst thy opponent was guilty of much cruel, merciless conduct, causing the death of hundreds of thousands of his creatures and inciting numerous wars, in which millions of his own peculiar nation and other nations were killed. While he has thus caused the death of untold numbers of human beings, while he acknowledged himself the cause of the evil that exists, while he admits that he caused the prophets to be and be false; notwithstanding all the charges of iniquity and crime that has been brought against thee, and all the opprobrium that has been cast upon thy name, no priest can point to a single instance where thou hast told a falsehood, where thou hast been guilty of theft, or where thou hast ever caused the death of a single human being. In this respect thou art immensely superior to thy antagonist, who, is said, daily, hourly and momentarily to cause the death of old and young, and who has in so many instances led his chosen people to falsehood, theft, robbery and murder.

As much as thou hast been slandered and abused by those who esteem themselves godly, thou hast never co-habited with a young maiden; thou has never committed adultery with the older sisters; thou hast never seduced an unprotected female; thou hast not indulged in drunkenness, nor made wine for (hose already drunk; thou hast not yielded to anger; thou hast not sought to deprive others of their dues; thou hast not descended to back-biting or slander, and, so far as we are able to learn, thou hast always conducted thyself like a gentleman, and in all these regards has acquitted thyself far more creditably than thy antagonist or his priests.

Of a truth, thou hast proved thyself a fast friend to the human race. Thou hast fostered science and education; thou hast promoted inventions and improvements of all kinds tending to increase the knowledge and happiness of man. It was thee, it was asserted, who first taught Copernicus and Galileo that the earth is round; that it revolves every twenty-four hours, and makes its yearly journey round the sun. It was thee who taught them of the countless worlds which float in space. It is well thou didst tins, for it seems thy antagonist nor his Son knew aught of it; or if they did, they deigned not to say a word of it in their book or in their teachings; and though the Church came near taking the lives of those two worthies for telling the world what thou taughtest them, we are left to conclude thou didst protect and befriend them.

It was thee who was said to have taught Faust and Guttenberg the art of all arts—printing—and one or both were cast into prison for their supposed intercourse with thee in the matter; and since that day pious men of the Church have repeatedly denounced the printing press as the greatest of evils—an invention directly from thee, and bound ultimately by the dissemination of light and knowledge, to overthrow the Church of God.

The great inventions of the application of steam, the telegraph, railroads, steamboats lightning-rods, friction-matches and the thousands of other useful inventions, have been denounced by thy enemies as thy work, and has having been incited by thee. The pious Presbyterians of Scotland even claimed fanning-mills to be an invention of thine, and denounced those who employed them for cleaning their oats and rye with using "the Devil's wind," and thought they ought to be cursed of Heaven therefor. It is not a little curious that thine enemies, after denouncing all these inventions named, with many others is thy productions, after man has used them and found great utility in them, and elevated the race thereby, should turn and try to claim them as the result of *their* religion, and to endeavour to establish its proof by their existence?

Few among thy enemies are men of science, and they advocate nothing which tends to impair their old system of theology. They still insist that it is thou who leads these scientific, learned men to discover truths in Nature which disprove the idle tales of ignorance found in that old book. Humboldt, Lyell, Darwin, Huxley, Wallace, Farraday, Tyndall, Draper and all that class of scholars, are denounced by the Church as thy servants—led and incited by thee; and the brave advocates of mental liberty and freedom of opinion, regardless of priestcraft and false theology, are a till more denounced and maligned. They are called children of thine own begetting; so that by the showing of priests, ignorance, superstition, mental slavery and fogyism belong to their side, while science, learning, invention, innovation, enterprise, mental freedom, and human progression, belong to thy kingdom, and are the measures of thy founding. We pray, then, that thy influence may increase in the world, while that of thy antagonist is bound to decrease.

In the matter of prowess and generalship much injustice is intentionally done thee. Thy antagonist is called all-mighty, and is said to be so powerful that naught can stand before him. But according to the confessions of thy enemies this is untrue. In every contest since thy expulsion from Paradise thou hast beaten. In the game for the great stake which thou and thy opponent have been playing for—mankind—thou hast held the trumps and won by far the larger share—say twenty to his one. He had greatly the advantage to begin with. He made everything just to suit himself, and had the fixing of conditions precisely as he wished, in peopling the world, when thou steppedest in, and with little effort or bluster, quickly swept the board. If he drowned the race of man to get rid of thy influence; if he caused nation after nation to be butchered and exterminated to get an advantage over thee; if he even sent his beloved son to be sacrificed and cruelly to be put to death to make a point on thee, and gain human souls to himself, it all seemed of no avail, for thou worsted him in every contest, thou hast come off victorious in every encounter and drawest still, a retinue of followers after thee, immensely more numerous than the sparse number of bigots and old fogies that he induces to follow him.

In view of these facts the injustice which has been done thee by thy enemies is most apparent. If thy antagonist is called the "mighty one" thou shouldst be called the "most mighty one." If, in memory of what he has done in the world, he should be called kind and benevolent, how much more shouldst thou be styled great, magnanimous, powerful and supergood! How wrong that the firm, including the father, and son, and the other individual, each holding a third interest, should exclude the greatest and best of the four, simply because of his excessive modesty, and on whom so much depends, even in the system that has been devised in their interest. Without thee what would their whole stock in trade be worth? Without thee what would become of the millions of priests that have cried aloud in then name? Without thee their whole system, their grand cathedrals, their elegant churches, their sonorous organs, their modest chapels, their monasteries, their nunneries, their seminaries, their colleges, their rites and ceremonies, their countless millions in tithes and exactions; and even the source of all their terror and fears would have no existence. In view of all this, we exclaim, how shabbily hast thou been treated! Thou hast been kicked out of the firm which should have contained a quartette, with thyself not farther back than second. It might, with propriety have read, Father, Devil, Son" and Ghost.

Another great injury we feel has been done thee, by the circulation of the report that thou art engaged in a never-ending contract, by the firm aforesaid, to do their dirty work for them—to keep up, without cessation, the sulphureous fires in the nether regions to a white heat, and therein with pitchforks and other cruel implements of torture, thee and thy sub devils to forever pitch and punch, to the latest moments of eternity, ninety-nine one-hundredths of the entire unfortunate human race! We cannot believe this of thee. It is all a priestly lie. Nothing in thy character, so far as known, justifies the horrible conclusion that thou wouldst ever engage in an employment so repulsive, and so execrable. As we said, thou hast ever shown thyself a friend to the human race, and hast rarely done an unkind act to any individual, and we feel assured that thou wouldst never be so base, so heartless, so inconceivably cruel, as to torture thus, countless millions of poor, weak, ignorant, helpless mortals through endless ages, for the trifling offences of a short earthly life, and just to please thy old antagonists—the firm of Father, Son and Co. We believe. Uncle Nicholas, if they wanted thee to do this work for them, that thou wouldst immediately spurn the idea, and bid them do it themselves.

No, no; imperious Lucifer, we can believe nothing of this cruelty of thee; the idea is too monstrous to attach to any being, god or demon, much less to a character so amiable as thou hast thus far shown thyself to be. The good and benevolent, the free, the wise the intelligent, the learned, the scientific, and the lovers of liberty, all follow in thy wake. As thou hast heretofore treated them well, thou doubtless will continue to do so. We much prefer to train in thy band with such men as Socrates, Plato, Copernicus, Galileo, Spinoza, Goethe, Schiller, Shakespeare, Byron, Humboldt, Volney, Paine, Franklin, Jefferson, Lincoln, and all such men, than to be numbered with the priests, the zealots, the hypocrites the bigots and the murderers, which make up the other crowd. We fear not to trust ourselves with thee and thy companions.

We would not deceive thee in the least; we have, as we said, grave doubts of thy existence as a person, but believe in thee just as firmly as we do in the existence of thy antagonist. Both stand on an equality in this respect. We regard you both as figments of the brains of ignorant superstitious nations, which intelligence and reason will ultimately drive from the earth.

Prince Lucifer, thou spirit of the air; we say then, speed the day—hasten on the time when truth and knowledge will rule supreme in all the earth; when popes, cardinals, bishops, priests, pastors and elders can be dispensed with; when the ignorance they have fastened on the race will give way; when all men can exclaim in truth, "we have knowledge, we have light, we are our own priests, we walk in Nature's lovely path, and none can make us afraid."

AMEN.

Cantenburg Freethought Association MEETS EVERY SUNDAY EVENING, AT THEIR HALL WORCESTER STREET, AT 7 O'clock. Canterburg Freethought Association DEBATING CLASS Every Thursday Evening, at 8 O'clock. Subscription - 2s. 6d. per quarter.

Printed at the Caxton Printing Works, Manchester Street, Christchurch.

The Rev. Joseph Cook: A Critique. By John Fiske, A.M., LL.B., Sometime Lecturer on Philosophy, and Instructor in History, Harvard University; Author of "Outlines of Cosmic Philosophy," "Darwinism and Other Essays," "Myths and Myth-Makers," etc. [Reprinted from the *North American Review*.] With a Preface By DR. G. Lewis, B.A., F.O.R.S. (IND.)

He that is first in his own cause seemeth just;

But his neighbour cometh and searcheth him.

Prov. xviii. 17.

Melbourne: W. H. Terry, 84 Russell Street. Printed by R. H. Williams, Scholastic Press, Pont Road, Richmond.

Preface.

IN assenting to the request that I should write a Preface to this reprint from the popular *N. A. Review* (March, 1881), I feel that no arduous task is being assumed. The author and the subject of the following pages need but little introduction.

John Fiske—Who has not heard of the brilliant American Spencerian? What library, making any pretensions to completeness, is without his volumes? The principal of these, "Outlines of Cosmic Philosophy," is one of the best works on Evolution; marked by acute thought, affluence of knowledge, thorough scholarship, and unrivalled perspicuity of exposition.

The subject of Mr. Fiske's critique—Mr. Joseph Cook, is as widely, if less honorably known. A few years since, he flashed, a comet, across the theological firmament of America, where, by the brightness of his shining, all other luminaries were threatened with speedy and eternal eclipse. But his career in that country, if dazzling, was not very long. He crossed to Britain where, to audiences more or less appreciative, he has lectured over a hundred times. The next spheres selected by Mr. Cook upon which to shed his illuminations, seem to be India and the Colonies. Mr. Cook's mission, it would appear, is to bolster up Orthodoxy in religion by the aid of science, and to rout the hosts of modern Heresy. Loud are the exultations of many of his admirers over the polemical success of this '*malleus hereticorum*.' Not only do they advertise him as "a leader of the religious thought of the nation, armed at all points to resist assaults upon the faith," but they add the assurance that he has "exposed the sophistries of Emerson, Theodore-Parker, and J. F. Clarke, of Darwin, Spencer, Tyndall, and Huxley; hushed Ingersoll, and turned the people of Boston from their heresies." Others, while admiring, have been less emphatic in equating this champion's achievements with the entire discomfiture of Infidelity.

After an unbiassed perusal of Mr. Cook's works, I am constrained to acquiesce largely in Prof. Fiske's verdict. I find a great deal of foliage, but little root, much superficiality, little insight into, or apprehension of principles; and a most pretentious massing together of often inconsequential propositions. It is true there is considerable ingenuity displayed; but that very ingenuity—causidical dexterity, I might call it—is itself provocative of distrust. "The language of truth," says a Greek poet, "is artless, and no subtle expositions are needed by a just cause, for it has an intrinsic reasonableness; but a false cause, weak in itself, requires skilful doctoring." Mr. Cook is generally best when he deals with subjects distinct from science and theology; his remarks on politics and political economy being often interspersed with good sense, though even these are not without much that is mere "blatherskite." Mr. Cook's friends will acquit me of vulgarity, when I assure them that the phrase is not mine, it is Mr. Cook's (v. Lecture on Future Punishment). Far be it from me to invalidate by any word of disparagement Mr. Cook's crusade against atheistic Materialism; but I fear nothing will militate so much against his success in that direction as his own tactics.

It need scarcely be remarked that the lecturer's philippics against Advanced Thought have had no effect upon the master-minds of that phase of intellectual development. Mr. E. W. Emerson writes that his father, Ralph Waldo Emerson, "never reads Mr. Cook's lectures." Dr. Shadworth Hodgson and Prof. Bain attend with befitting respect to the objections of Dr. Ward against their Necessitarianism. Herbert Spencer does not ignore a critic like Prof. Green or James Martineau, Nor does Dr. Tyndall flinch from crossing swords with the last named distinguished Christian philosopher. Prof. Huxley does not hesitate to review Virchow; and Dr. Vance Smith is ever ready to contend for Unitarianism against theologians like Liddon and Farrar. But these men have no word for the fulminations of Mr. Cook. At the same time, it must not be supposed that the Boston champion has been allowed undisturbed possession of the controversial arena. James Freeman Clarke has subjected his labored proofs of the Trinity, Atonement, etc., to a searching analysis. Col. It. G. Ingersoll, when attacked by Mr. Cook, "came to Boston and replied before the largest audience ever assembled in that city." In England, Mr. Cook was courteously challenged to a public discussion by Charles Bradlaugh; this discussion, however, was declined, on the plea of a desire not to advertise Infidelity! Dr. W. Hitchman and other freethought lecturers have also devoted some attention to his arguments.

Before closing this Introduction, it may be well to give a sort of *précis* of Mr. Cook's conclusions on some interesting points of theological speculation.

I. Spiritualism. Mr. Cook's knowledge of this subject seems to have been acquired chiefly through the medium of books, and one remarkable *séance* at the house of a well known Spiritualist. Mr. Cook is satisfied that many of the phenomena called spiritual are genuine and are produced by *psychic force*, but he is undecided whether that force is under the control of men exclusively, or under that of both spirits and men,—the theory adopted by Crookes and Zollner.

II. The Trinity. Mr. Cook's propositions on this subject are:-1. The Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are one God; 2. Each has a peculiarity incommunicable to the others; 3. Neither is God without the others; 4. Each with

the others is God.

III. Total Depravity. By this, Mr. Cook means "the utter disarrangedness of man's faculties previous to regeneration."

IV. Atonement. "We are assured that "The Atonement consists in the substitution of Christ's voluntary sacrificial chastisement for man's punishment. Guilt may mean either one of two very different things. It signifies sometimes personal blameworthiness; at others, liability to suffer to maintain the honor of a violated law. It is in this latter sense of the word that we are taught that guilt was taken off from sinners and placed upon our Lord." "Angels cannot understand how God could have condescended to make an Atonement; but there is no other screen known under Heaven or among men, by which the black past can be separated from our consciences and from God's face. A screen does not remove, it only hides; the black past remains, but it is hidden." Mr. Cook mentions the following as among popular misrepresentations of the doctrine: "That God punishes by substitution; that the Atonement involves a transfer of moral qualities from person to person; and that it saves, irrespective of character, whoever has faith."

V. Future Punishment. Its endlessness Mr. Cook infers from the endlessness of sin. Sin, when continued, blinds the judgment, he argues, so that truth becomes unwelcome. The soul may permanently lose the desire to be holy. The human being may become wilfully impenitent.

The punishment, however, does not befall the majority of humanity; nor is it physical. Mr. Cook's definition of perdition is, "permanent dissimilarity of feeling with God, and its consequences."

From such expositions of the foregoing topics, it will be seen how far this lecturer is amenable to the charge of "maintaining Orthodoxy by abandoning it." That "Orthodoxy" will live for many a day without Mr. Cook's advocacy is likely enough; but one feels less confidence in predicting that it will long survive it.

To controvert the positions of Mr. Cook is not the object of this Introduction, else many reasons could be adduced to justify the belief that Mr. Joseph Cook has not yet scaled the heights of all wisdom and knowledge nor attained a perfect comprehension of the Divine Counsels.

I may state that on the interesting subject of Eschatology, the investigative reader will derive valuable assistance from a study of the works mentioned below.

It is, perhaps, fitting to add that in introducing these pages there is no intention to impugn the sincerity and earnestness of Mr. Cook's motives; it is only his methods that excite animadversion.

GEO. LEWIS.

Restitution of All Things, by Rev. A. Jukes. (1873)

Mercy and Judgment, by Rev. F. W. Farrar, D.D. (1881)

What is the Truth as to Everlasting Punishment? by Rev. F. N. Oxenhain, M.A. (1881)

The Rev. Joseph Cook a Critique.

"THE small philosopher is a great character in New England; His fundamental rule of logical procedure is to guess at the half, and multiply by two. [Applause.]"

Cook's "Boston Monday Lectures: Biology," page 51.

It is only two or three years since the "philosopher," front whom this text is quoted, was himself "a great character in New England," inasmuch as he could give a lecture once every week, in one of the largest halls of New England's principal city, and could entertain his audience of two or three thousand people with discussions of the most vast and abstruse themes of science and metaphysics. The success with which he entertained his audience is carefully chronicled for us in the volumes made up from the reports of his lectures, in which parenthetical notes of "laughter," "applause," or "sensation" occur as frequently as in ordinary newspaper reports of stump-speeches or humorous convivial harangues. As a social phenomenon, this singular career of Mr Cook possesses considerable interest—enough, at any rate, to justify a brief inquiry as to his "fundamental rule of procedure."

Among the wise and witty sayings of the ancients with which our children are puzzled and edified in the first dozen pages of the Greek "Reader," there is a caustic remark attributed to Phokion, on the occasion of being very violently applauded by the populace: "Dear me," said the old statesman, "can it be that I have been making a fool of myself?" So, when three thousand people are made to laugh and clap their hands over statements; about the origin of species, or the anatomy of the nervous system, the first impulse of any scientific inquirer of ordinary sagacity and experience is to ask in what meretricious fashion these serious subjects can have been treated, in order to have produced such a result. The inference may be cynical, perhaps, but it is none the less likely to be sound. In Mr. Cook's case, one does not need to read far in the published reports of his lectures to see that his fundamental rule of procedure is something very different from any of the rules by which truth is wooed and won by scientific inquirers. Among Mr. Mill's comprehensive canons of logical method one

might search in vain for a specimen of the method employed by Mr. Cook. Of the temper of mind, indeed, in which scientific inquiries are conducted, Mr. Cook has no more conception than Laura Bridgman could have of Pompeian red, or of a chord of the minor ninth. The process of holding one's judgment in suspense over a complicated problem, of patiently gathering and weighing the evidence on every side, of subjecting one's own first-formed hypotheses to repeated verification, of clearly comprehending and fairly stating opposing views, of setting forth one's conclusions at last, guardedly and with a distinct consciousness of the conditions under which they are tenable,—all this sort of thing is absolutely foreign to Mr. Cook's nature. To Mr. Cook, a scientific thesis is simply a statement over which it is possible to get up a fight. The game-cock is his totem; to him the bones of the vertebrate sub-kingdom are only so many bones of contention, and the sponge is interesting chiefly as an emblem which is never, on any account, to be "thrown up." He talks accordingly of scientific men lying in wait for Mr. Darwin, ready to pounce on him like a tiger on its prey; he is very fond of exhibiting what he calls the "strategic point" of a scientific book or theory; and altogether his attitude is bellicose to a degree that is as unbecoming in a minister of the gospel as it is out of place in a discussion of scientific questions. His favorite method of dealing with a scientific writer is to quote from him all sorts of detached statements and inferences, and, without the slightest regard to the writer's general system of opinions or habits of thought, to praise or vituperate the detached statements according to some principle which it is not always easy for the redder to discover, but which has always doubtless some reference to their supposed bearings upon the peculiar kind of orthodoxy of which Mr. Cook appears as the champion. There are some writers whom Mr. Cook thinks it necessary always to berate, no matter what they say. If they happen to say something which ought to be quite satisfactory to any reasonable person of orthodox opinions, Mr. Cook either accuses them of insincerity, or represents them as making "concessions." This last device, I am sorry to be obliged to add, is not an uncommon one with theological controversialists, whose zeal exceeds their scrupulousness. When a man makes a statement which expresses his deepest convictions, there is no easier way of seeming to knock away the platform on which he stands than to quote his statement, and describe it as something which he has reluctantly "conceded." With the principal writers on evolution, Mr. Cook is continually found resorting to this cheap and vulgar device. For example, when Professor Tyndall declares that "if a right-hand spiral movement of the particles of the brain could be shown to occur in love, and a left-hand spiral movement in hate, we should be as far off as ever from understanding the connection of this physical motion with the spiritual manifestations,"—when Professor Tyndall declares this, he simply asserts what is a cardinal proposition with the whole group of English philosophers to which he belongs. With Professor Huxley, as well as with Mr. Spencer, it is a fundamental proposition that psychical phenomena cannot possibly be interpreted in terms of matter and motion, and this proposition they have at various times set forth and defended,—and what is still more to the purpose, have proved it. In the chapter on "Matter and Spirit," in my work on "Cosmic Philosophy," I have fully expounded this point, and have further illustrated it in treating of the "Unseen World." With the conclusions there set forth, the remark of Professor Tyndall thoroughly agrees, and it does so because all these expressions of opinion and all these arguments are part and parcel of a coherent system of anti-materialistic thought adopted by the English school of evolutionists. Yet when Mr. Cook quotes Professor Tyndall's remark, he does it in this wise: "It is notorious that even Tyndall concedes," etc., etc.

By proceeding in this way, Mr. Cook finds it easy to make out a formidable array of what he calls "the concessions of evolutionists." He first gives the audience a crude impression of some sort of theory of evolution, such as no scientific thinker ever dreamed of, or, to speak more accurately, he plays upon the crude impression already half formed in the average mind of his audience, and which, to do him justice, he seems to share himself. The *average* notion of the doctrine of evolution possessed in common by an audience big enough to fill Tremont Temple, would no doubt seem to Mr. Darwin or to Mr. Spencer something altogether fearful and wonderful. Playing with this sort of crude material, Mr. Cook puts together a series of numbered propositions, which remind one of those interminable auction-catalogues of Walt Whitman, which some of our British cousins, more ardent than discriminating, mistake for a truly American species of inspired verse. In this long catena of statements, almost everything is easily seen to disagree with the crude general impression to which the speaker appeals, and almost everything is accordingly set down as a "concession." And as the audience go out after the lecture, they doubtless ask one another, in amazed whispers, how it is that sensible men who make so many "concessions" can find it in their hearts to maintain the doctrine of evolution at all!

Sometimes Mr. Cook goes even farther than this, and, in the very act of quoting an author's declared opinions, expressly refuses to give him credit for them. Thus he has the impudence to say: "Even Herbert Spencer, *who would be very glad to prove the opposite*, says, in his *Biology*, 'The proximate chemical principles or chemical units—albumen, fibrine, gelatine, or the hypothetical proteine substance—cannot possess the property of forming the endlessly varied structures of animal forms.'" Mr. Cook here lays claim to a knowledge of his author's innermost thoughts and wishes that is quite remarkable. For a fit parallel one would have to cite the instance of the German who flogged his son for profanity, though the boy had not opened his

mouth. "You dinks tamn," exclaimed the irate father, "and I vips you for dat."

As there are some writers whom Mr. Cook thinks it always necessary to vituperate, no matter what they say, so there are others whom he finds it convenient to quote, as foils to the former, and to mention with praise on all occasions, though it is difficult to assign the reasons for this preference except on the hypothesis that Mr. Cook has an implicit faith in the simple and confiding nature of his audience. Before giving these lectures, Mr. Cook had studied a while in Germany, and his citations of German writers show how far he deems it safe to presume on New England's ignorance of what Germany thinks. It is nice to have such a learned country as Germany at one's disposal to hurl at the heads of people whose "outlook in philosophy does not reach beyond the Straits of Dover"; it saves a great deal of troublesome argument, and still more painful examination of facts. This English opinion is all very well, you know, but it comes from a philosopher "whose star is just touching the western pines," and a German whom I am about to quote, whose book I "hold in my hand," and "whose star is in the ascendant," does not agree with it. All this is extremely neat and convincing, apparently, to the crowd in Tremont Temple. With all Germany at his disposal, however, it must be acknowledged that Mr. Cook makes a very sparing use of his resources. He quotes Helmholtz and Wundt every now and then with warm approval, though wherein they should be found any more acceptable to the orthodox world than Tyndall and Bain, it is not easy to see, save that the ill-repute of German free-thinkers takes somewhat longer to get diffused in New England than the ill-repute of English free-thinkers. Then, among these great Germans who are to set the English-speaking world aright, we have Delitzsch! To speak of Wundt and Delitzsch is as if one were to speak of John Stuart Mill and Stephen Pearl Andrews! And then comes the admirable Lotze, whom Mr. Cook is continually setting off as a foil to Herbert Spencer. On page 170 of the lectures on "Heredity" he enumerates, with special emphasis, those opinions of Lotze which he deems as of especial importance with regard to the relations between matter and mind, and then proceeds to deprecate the "thunder" which he presumes he has evoked "from all quarters of the Spencerian sky." But, considering that the propositions he quotes from Lotze express the very views of Herbert Spencer, only somewhat inadequately worded, it would seem that the alarm Mr. Cook expresses cannot be very real, and the thunder in question is only a kind of comic-opera thunder manufactured behind the curtain for the benefit of the acquiescent audience. By way of example, the fourth proposition quoted with approval from Lotze by Mr. Cook reads thus: "Physical phenomena point to an underlying being to whom they belong, but do not determine whether that being is material or immaterial." Now this is Spencerism, pure and unmitigated, and it is a crucial proposition too, pointing out the drift of the whole philosophy before which it is set up. The fact that Mr. Cook adopts such an opinion when stated by Lotze, but vituperates the same opinion when stated by Spencer, reveals to us, with a pungent though not wholly delicious flavor, the "true inwardness" of his "fundamental method of procedure."

That method, it must be acknowledged with due reference to the *bon mot* of the old Greek statesman, is a method well adapted to conciliate the favor of an immense audience, even in so cultivated a city as Boston. We are descended from fighting ancestors, and many of us, who care little for the disinterested discussion of scientific theories, still like to see a man knocked down or impaled, provided the knocking down be done with a syllogistic club, or the impaling be restricted to such a hard substance as is afforded by the horns of a dilemma. It satisfies our combative instincts, without shocking our physical sympathies or making any great demand on our keener thinking powers, which most people do most of all dislike to be called upon to exercise. To this kind of feeling Mr. Cook's lectures appeal, and the peculiar character of his success seems to show that he knew very well how to deal with it. In a moment of winning frankness he exclaims: "Do you suppose that I think that this audience can be *cheated*? I do not know where in America there is another weekly audience with as many brains in it; at least, I do not know where, in New England, I should be so likely to be tripped up if I were to make an incorrect statement as here." ("Biology," page 67.) After this persuasive little dose of what the newspapers call "toffy," Mr. Cook proceeds to show his respect for the learning of his audience in some remarks on *bathybius*, which, as he condescendingly explains, is a name derived from two Greek words, meaning *deep* and *sea*!! The profound knowledge of elementary Greek thus shown is quite equalled by his account of *bathybius* from the zoological point of view. He begins by telling his hearers that, in a paper published in the "Microscopical Journal" in 1868, Prof. Huxley "announced his belief that the gelatinous substance found in the ooze of the bodes of the deep seas is a sheet of living matter extending around the globe." Furthermore, of "this amazingly strategic (!) and haughtily trumpeted substance . . . Huxley assumed that it was in the past, and would be in the future, the progenitor of all the life on the planet." Now, it is not true that, in the paper referred to, Prof. Huxley announces any such belief, or makes any such assumption, as is here ascribed to him; but we shall see, in a moment, that Mr. Cook's system of quotation is peculiar in enabling him to extract from the text of an author any meaning whatever that may happen to suit his purposes. This slanderous misrepresentation enables the lecturer to come in with great effect at the close of his third lecture, and earn an ignoble round of applause, by holding up the current number of the "American Journal of Science and Arts" (which he would appear to have picked up at a book-store on his way to the lecture-room) and citing from it, as

the fifty-first and closing "concession" of evolutionists, "that bathybius has been discovered in 1875, by the ship Challenger, to be—hear, O heavens! and give ear, O earth!—sulphate of lime; and that when dissolved it crystallizes as gypsum. [Applause.]" This is what Mr. Cook calls striking, with the "latest scientific intelligence," at the "bottom stem" of the great tree of evolution. The "latest scientific intelligence" with him means the last book or article which he has glanced over without comprehending its import, but from which he has contrived to glean some statement calculated to edify his audience and scatter the hosts of Midian. In point of fact, the identification of bathybius with sulphate of lime was set down by Sir Wyville Thomson only as a suspicion, to which Prof. Huxley, like a true man of science, at once accorded all possible weight, while leaving the question open for further discussion. Only a mountebank, however, dealing with an audience upon whose ignorance of the subject he might safely rely, could pretend to suppose that the fate of the doctrine of evolution was in any way involved in the question as to the organic nature of bathybius. The amazing strategy was all Mr. Cook's own, and the haughty trumpeting appears to have been chiefly done with his own very brazen instrument.

I said a moment ago that Mr. Cook's system of quotation is peculiar. The following instance is so good that it will bear citing at some length. According to Mr. Cook, Prof. Huxley says, in his article on Biology in the ninth edition of the "Encyclopædia Britannica": "*Throughout almost the whole series of living beings, we find agamogenesis, or not-sexual generation.*" After a pause, Mr. Cook proceeded in a lower voice: "When the topic of the origin of the life of our Lord on the earth is approached from the point of view of the microscope, some men, who know not what the holy of holies in physical and religious science is, say that we have no example of the origin of life without two parents.' Mr. Cook then cites the familiar instances of parthenogenesis in bees and silk-moths, and proceeds: "Take up your Mivart, your Lyell your Owen, and you will read [where?] this same important fact which Huxley here asserts, when he says that the law that perfect individuals may be virginally born extends to the higher forms of life. I am in the presence of Almighty God; and yet, when a great soul like the tender spirit of our sainted Lincoln, in his early days, with little knowledge but with great thoughtfulness, was troubled by this difficulty, and almost thrown into infidelity by not knowing that the law that there must be two parents is not universal. I am willing to allude, even in such a presence as this, to the latest science concerning miraculous conception. [Sensation.]"

Concerning the good taste, or the orthodox propriety, of "approaching the origin of the life of our Lord on earth from the point of view of the microscope," something might be said were there need of it. The rhetorical vulgarity of the above passage will be as obvious to most of our readers as its logical absurdity. All that I am now concerned with, however, is its unscrupulous misstatement. Let us look back for a moment at the italicized quotation from Prof. Huxley's article and see what he really does say. Treating of the whole subject of agamogenesis in the widest possible way by including it under the more general process of cell-multiplication, Prof. Huxley says: "Common as the process is in plants and in the lower animals, it becomes rare among the higher animals. In these, the reproduction of the whole organism from a part, in the way indicated above, ceases. At most we find that the cells at the end of an amputated portion of the organism are capable of reproducing the lost part, and, in the very highest animals, even this power vanishes in the adult. . . . *Throughout almost the whole series of living beings, however, we find concurrently with the process of agamogenesis, or asexual generation, another method of generation, in which the development of the germ into an organism resembling the parent depends on an influence exerted by living matter different from the germ. This is gamogenesis, or sexual generation.*" (Encyc. Brit., 9th edition, "Biology," page 686.) Comparing the italicized passage here with Mr. Cook's italicized quotation, we see vividly illustrated the "fundamental method of procedure" by which the "Monday Lectureship" jumps from a statement about the reproduction of a lobster's claws to the inference that a man may be born without a father. Every one has heard of the worthy clergyman who introduced a scathing sermon on a new-fangled variety of ladies' head-dress by the appropriate text, "Top-knot come down!" On being reminded by one of his deacons that the full verse seemed to read, "Let him that is upon the house-top not come down," the pastor boldly justified his abridgment on the ground that any particular collocation of words in Scripture is as authoritative as any other, since all parts of the Bible are equally inspired. Probably Mr. Cook would justify his own peculiar principle of abridgment on the familiar ground that the end sanctifies the means, and that if a statement seems helpful to "the truth" in general, it is no matter whether the statement itself is true or not.

Enough of this. If we were to go through with Mr. Cook's volumes in detail, we should find little else but misrepresentations of facts, misconceptions of principles, and floods of tawdry rhetoric, of which the specimens here quoted are quite sufficient to illustrate his "fundamental method of procedure." I have not treated him seriously or with courtesy, because there is nothing in his matter or in his manner that would justify, or even excuse, a serious method of treatment. The only aspect of his career which really affords matter for grave reflection is the ease with which he succeeded for the moment in imposing on the credulity and in appealing to the prejudices of his public. The eagerness with which the orthodox world hailed the appearance of this new

champion—whose very orthodoxy withal seems to be but little sounder than his science—cannot but remind one, with sad emphasis, of Oxenstjern's famous remark: "*Quam parva sapientia mundus regitur!*"

vignette

Printed By R.H. Williams. Scholastic Press, Punt Road, Richmond.

The Religious Signs of the Times; A Lecture, By Rev. Joseph Cook, of Boston, U.S.A., Delivered in Auckland, New Zealand, on, Tuesday October 10, 1882 Auckland, N.Z.: Ward, Lock & Co.'s Agency, Fort Street. (F. W. Boykton.) 1882.

Printed by John Brame, at his General Printing Office, High Street, Auckland, N.Z.

The Signs of the Times.

[The following Report of the Rev. Mr. Cook's Lecture is supplied from the shorthand notes of Mr. Kinsella, "Herald" reporter, and the proofs have been revised by that gentleman.]

ON the 10th of October, 1882, the Rev. JOSEPH COOK, of Boston, delivered the following address, in Abbott's Opera House, Auckland. The building was crowded to excess in all parts, most of the Nonconformist clergy of the Province, and several Anglican ministers, having seats on the stage. The lecturer had only just arrived by steamer from Australia, and was booked to leave by the California steamer, which left Auckland in a few hours.

After the usual greetings of welcome, the Rev. Lecturer said—There is nothing so much worth living for as death. You ask me to-day to speak on the religious signs of our times. These signs are first personal, then national, and next cosmopolitan. To begin with the "personal" signs of the time. It is at least certain that our time is short. No man or woman here would sign a bond to remain on earth for ever. The highest thing here is our hope of going higher. I have never looked into your faces before, and probably I shall never look upon them again. I shall speak to you as if you were already disembodied, as if you could feel yourselves already transformed into citizens of that universal kingdom made up of the spirits of men once upon the earth, and towards which all men hasten. I reject utterly the doctrine of conditional immortality, as both philosophical and exegetical lunacy. I take it for granted here to-day that we are all expecting to go somewhere when we go hence, and that those who now live in wickedness have no good reason for anticipating annihilation. I am not here to oppose either the doctrine of conditional immortality or that of annihilation, but I must begin by speaking of the "personal" signs of the time, and therefore allow me to say that according to individual outlook I cannot accept annihilation, for I do not find it either in Scripture or in reason. If our signs were toward annihilation—if that doctrine were sound, then those most likely to be annihilated would suffer least. If there be no immortality, except for those who have experienced the "new birth"; if immortality be a gift only through faith in Christ, then this Bible is a riddle, or rather those who read and study it are misled. This Book was written for the millions. It was intended that he who runs may read it, and gather from it the chief signs of the age. You know that the men who have studied on their knees have found in it all the signs applicable to their lives. They have found in it that there is a resurrection for the wicked as well as the just. Although some shall be rescued, there is proof in it of the immortality of the wicked. The Book is an enigma if this doctrine of conditional immortality, which we hear preached in some eccentric quarters, be true. I know a man who defends that doctrine. I have great respect for him as a man. I happened once to take tea with him, and I mentioned a work which was written in reply to his book. He said, "That book is the best answer to my doctrine." It was written by Professor Meade—"The Soul Here and Hereafter." That was admitted to be an overwhelming reply to the doctrine. Professor Dormer's answer—"Scientific Theology"—is also an overwhelming reply. It is, in effect, that annihilation is a form of the materialistic thought, which assumes that there is no soul whatever, and that when we perish physically we perish spiritually. Time will not permit me to enter fully into details of the statement of our hopes of immortality, but before I quit this part of my theme let me say that I am willing to defend my personal hope of immortality not merely in the presence of this age, but in the presence of physical science. Shakespeare tells us of the thought in his mind, and what may happen after death. "We read there of that "undiscovered country," the "dread of something after death," and the "conscience that makes cowards of us all." We are so put together that our organic instincts anticipate punishment. From this we reason to its correlate, as we reason from the fin of the fish to water, from the wing of the bird to air, from the eye to light, from the ear to sound, and from the migratory instinct to climate. God does not build half joints. There is not one half inch of the universe but is occupied to some special purpose. There is in man a constitutional tendency to anticipate punishment after death. Christianity strengthens this tendency. Education strengthens it, but it was in man before. It was a part of his constitution in the age of Greece and Paganism. It is a part of his constitution to-day, even in the darkest lands of this world, where Christianity has not been, and is not yet, It grows with man, and just as we reason to the correlate from the fin to water, from the wing to air,

from the eye to light, from the ear to sound, from the migratory instinct to climate, so we may reason to the ineradicable tendencies which the spirit manifests, from punishment to reward. All great philosophers and inquirers have laid it down that where you find a tendency you find its correlate, or something to match it. This is purely scientific reasoning, and it applies to the wicked as well as to the righteous. But conscience without being consulted always magisterially exerts itself, and unless forcibly stopped it goes forward to anticipate judgment. Here we experience its command, and hereafter it will confirm its decision. It proves that there is immortality for all, even on the basis of this organic instinct whose anticipation moans something. Otherwise our natures are senseless lies, and our constitutions are concrete falsehoods. The tendency is strengthened by Christianity, just as you may strengthen the arm, but you cannot strengthen that until you have got the arm. You cannot improve what you have not, nor make a man other than he is, any more than you could one of the canino race. But it is in man to anticipate reward and punishment after death. It is written in us that death does not end all. I say that physiology shows that we are woven by something not ourselves. Our organization is put together with a force adequate to account for the adaptation of means to ends. This weaving power which goes before us must have existed before its own effects. And if it goes before, why may it not exist after its effects? This weaving power is the cause of organization: life produces mechanism, but mechanism is not a cause of life. Every cause must go before its effect. I went once into the study of the greatest physiologist in London. The first question I asked was, "What is this that weaves us?" The answer was, "Life." "But," I said, "Do you define life as Aristotle did: the cause from which organism comes, the force that weaves us?" "Yes," he replied, "There is no other definition that can be sustained. Life goes before us as the weaver before the web. Do we not find full authority for it that this power, as it goes before us, exists independently of the organization. It takes no ghost to tell us that," was the reply. Of course, every cause is independent of its effect. When I strike this platform with my hand the blow must be given before the noise succeeds. And here we have it, according to the foremost physiologist of our time, that life is a special and independent force, going before organization and existing independently; so may it not exist after disorganization and independently of that? (Applause.) And just as this force has woven one body, it may weave us another in a future state of existence. It is no more wonderful that we should begin to live than that we should live; it is less wonderful that we should continue to live than that we began to live. This reasoning applies alike to the wicked and the holy, and there is no standing ground for annihilation or conditional immortality. It is less wonderful that we should continue to live than that life should be woven out of stiff loam clay. What is it that shines through a man's face when the soul is active? This Book speaks of a spiritual body. Professor Muller says that the germ of a spiritual body is in us. Thus we have not only the natural, but the germ of the spiritual body'. The elements that are in us are our best teachers. Philosophers are bending over the question that the Greeks raised, when they began to ask what is it that shines through a man's face? Something looks through us, and flames within us. I do not think it is mere matter that causes this light that beams through the eyes, that shines on the forehead, and is put out of this natural body when we die. Three things there are in us—the things we can touch, the things we can think, and the thing that shines through us. There is the spiritual body in some sense here in us now, as the old poet subtly says:

*There shines through all our earthly dress
Bright shoots of everlastingness.*

Bacon said that the first act of God was the physical light, but the supreme act was the light that beams through the faces of human beings—the soul. The old Greeks raised the question, as I have already said. What is the source of this light, what was the light of the Transfiguration? What was the source of the light in the face of Moses when he descended from the Mount? What was the light in the countenance of Stephen, which made the men who saw him speak of it as like the face of an angel? I believe that what shines is something not put into the germ: that man has a natural body and a spiritual body; that man is made up of body and soul. The spirit is not two things, nor yet one thing", mere matter, as the materialist says, but three things—the thing you can touch, the thing that thinks, and the thing that shines. This is the enswathement, the pneumatic of the spiritual body in the germ. We are not to have a mere bodiless immortality, we are to have spiritual bodies. This spiritual enswathement is in us here and now; it is in the wicked as well as the holy. The Bible makes not merely a riddle of itself, if the doctrine of conditional immortality be truth, but is brimful of contradictions. We have been purposelessly frightened by this work, if annihilation or conditional immortality is to be found in it. Where it speaks of immortality it co-ordinates it with punishment and reward. God bless that great preacher when he calls this conditional immortality the most mischievous thing that ever was. A person has said that he incurred more responsibility than any other man living for resisting the spread of it. But Mr. Spurgeon said, "I am quite prepared to take the responsibility." I thank God that this doctrine is opposed by a man who has preached to more human beings, and for a longer period, than any other man on earth. I give you my rapid

reasons for saying that when I go hence I am going somewhere, and there is no annihilation in the question. What I have said concerns the spiritual body and the facts of physiology. They all stand in thorough accord with the revelation of immortality in this Book. We are going, and going soon, to the judgment bar of the Most High God. Demosthenes said that every public address should begin with an incontrovertible proposition. It is incontrovertible that a little while ago we were not here, and a little while hence we will be here no more.

I wish to solemnize this occasion by a reference to the great objects that are before you. I have stood this morning on some of your extinct volcanoes. I have looked over an almost paradisiacal landscape, from the top of Mount Eden. I do not know when I was more charmed by any outlook than this of yours. I can imagine how profoundly attached you must be to this part of the world—to these blest islands to which you have come, and how attached you are to the British Empire whence you came. But the time will soon come when you and I will cease to be Britons or Americans. We are to go hence, and our concern therefore is with the Kingdom that is everlasting. Have I not proved my proposition, that the chief thing worth living for is death? One hundred and thirty-five thousand working hours are all that any man has to live. Few people begin their working life before twenty-five years of age, and very few continue it beyond their seventieth year. Between twenty-five and seventy you have forty-five years. Suppose you leave out the fifty-two Sundays in each year, and thirteen days for recreation, you have three hundred days in each year—the sum makes 135,000 working hours. That is the whole of your earthly career. This is not theology but arithmetic. It is as certain as "Gunter's Chain." We are going hence, and going soon. You think you are the tree of the human race, but you are only the leaves. Both the tree and the leaves fall. Some of you have not ninety, some not seventy some not ten, thousand hours to live. I do not know that the Pacific will float me to my native land. This is my last address in Australasia. It is commonplace to say that we all must die. But it is not commonplace that says you shall all go hence at the end of 135,000 hours. That is certain without; a scintilla of doubt about it. We must then be delivered from the love of sin and from the guilt of it, otherwise in the nature of things there can be no peace in the hereafter for us. The personal signs of the times are as significant as the hand-writing on the wall was to the King of Babylon. We must be delivered from the love of sin, for if we are to live with God we know that who lives with God must hate it. No two beings can walk together unless they agree. And when we are delivered from the love of sin, we are not necessarily delivered from the guilt of it. We must have deliverance from the love of sin, from the guilt of it, and we must go hence—these are three mighty facts.

I will now speak to you of the "national" signs of the time. Let me address you as the "Pilgrim Fathers" of the fairest and foremost domain of the Southern Hemisphere. You have not, in all the Australias, four millions of people. But the first three millions set the fashions for the millions that are *to* follow. I wish I could make it enter into your hearts and minds, as the lightning enters into the oak, that you are the leaders of the ages to come. The three millions that first come to a new land are more important than any ten million fifty years after. Look at the first three millions that came to my own Republic. They were the people who set fashions in politics and religion, customs and law. They laid the corner stone of the future government and power. They made some mistakes, and bitterly indeed have they atoned them. They did not, for instance, throttle the young viper of slavery, which grew almost immediately into a monstrosity that coiled itself about the whole body politic, and which in later years they were obliged to wrench from its holding. But in the good or great things they have done, those first three millions were more important in determining what the "United States" was to become than any twenty millions of the inhabitants now alive. I beg to insist upon it, therefore, that you who belong to the first three millions who came here, have a responsibility not easily measured in its vastness or its solemnity. It has pleased Providence to bring into existence, in the Australias, the most brilliant and most powerful set of circumstances in the Southern Hemisphere. I have not seen all the cities of your Islands. I had hoped to beat up from Invercargill, through Duuedin, Christchurch, and Wellington to Auckland. But certain accidents to sea going vessels upset this plan. I had hoped to be a week in this beautiful city. I have only six hours to remain here. I think it is one of the signs of the time that at so short notice in this place an assembly of this kind could be gathered together. Do not think I underrate your city because my stay is so short. I have seen your people. I have heard much in their honour. I believe I am leaving a part of my soul in this place. I have seen everywhere I went testimony of the great future that awaits you. Brazil cannot match the three foremost cities of the Australias. Rio, the largest city of Brazil, is not as large as Melbourne, or as Sydney now is. But Sydney hopes soon to be larger than Melbourne—(laughter)—while Melbourne is determined to be larger than Sydney. Adelaide is a most cultured and brilliant city. The second cities of Brazil are not equal to those of the Australias—Pernambuco is inferior to the Australian cities of second rank. Brazil has ten millions of population, but of these some millions are in a servile condition. If not slaves, they belong to a class, the Peons, that are as bad as slaves. But you will never have a servile class in Australasia. I know what criticism has pointed to for Queensland. I have looked into the faces of the population there, and I see a thunderbolt there that will strike if ever an attempt is made to impose slavery upon them. And you will have thunderbolts cast at you from British power if you should organize slavery in these lands, and not only from British power, but from the

highest quarters here, from your educated men, from your ministers, from your lawyers, and statesmen, You are for ever to be a free people. The first sign of the time is this very fact, that you are the only thoroughly free people in the whole southern hemisphere, a people who believe in government by the people for the people. And you are a part of a limited monarchy—very limited here by the way. (Laughter.) Here, as in America, you have a great prospect. If the American Union had never been treated somewhat badly by the British Government, I believe we Americans would be colonists as you are to this day. My great grandfather was a colonist and an officer in Washington's army. If you had such a George as we had for King, I do not know that he would not have been your last. The truth is, that England must hereafter have good Kings or Queens, or none. (Applause.) Do not suppose that I am obliquely hinting at any prospect of a change. No—long: as the Southern Cross and Ursa Major, those bright constellations that shine in the southern and northern heavens, shall roll in their course—so long may the Australias and Great Britain live in peace with each other, and belong to the same empire. (Applause.) As it is a part of your glory that you belong to a free people and government, and to an Empire greater than the Empire of the Cæsars so is it part of your usefulness that you are not detached from it, but that the stalwart right arm of both sides of your Empire shall be engaged with America in the cause of freedom. This should be the morning dream of both, keeping company with the hours and encircling the globe, spreading the light of truth, and protecting the weak. (Applause.)

The quantity of your population is another "national" sign of the time. I don't like to venture on prophecy, but I think it is a moderate hope that you will have, at no very remote period, one hundred million of people in the Australias. You ought to make provision for such a population. For such a provision to be made you stand in trust. It is as pilgrims, as sojourners here, as citizens of a kingdom not of this world that I would have you act while in a kingdom which is of this world. I would have you act as those should act who will have to give account to a government on High. Be prepared to give it soon, and give it thoroughly. Consider how you should acquit yourselves in this matter. It is a matter for which you will be held responsible, and you ought to pray for the power to do your part in such a manner as may please God perfectly. That would be claimed of us if we could have been among the Pilgrim Fathers, the colonists of old, who carried the culture of the British Islands to New England. Here you are colonizing an immense territory, and laying the foundation of a truly mighty country. You are now as the Pilgrim Fathers were once in regard to America. You will be responsible to God for the opportunities you miss, for the duty you neglect. You are turning the streams, digging their new channels. It is for you to suffer no indignity to befall the coming population, who may never hear or see the England of their fathers. I hear a great many things of your young people, but I do not believe all that I hear. Some of the future population are now children in your schools. And where are you who brought your torches lighted at Cambridge, Oxford, Edinburgh, or Glasgow—where are you that should be pillars of fire in the darkness of the night, and overcome God's enemies against the morning. Your young men and women will want new fashions. If they have never seen the best civilization of the West, it is possible they may not invent anything equal to it. You must take off the chariot wheel of the spirit of unrule. You must block the wheels if the ground is steep. A critical time is coming, when you will have to transfer the authority of Pilgrim Fathers to generations born here, made up of individuals who never saw Great Britain.

Another sign of the time in your national affairs is the quality of your population. The quantity of population does not make a nation good. I thank God that you are English and Scotch, and for the most part Protestant. You have a per centage of Asiatics in your population. God bless all working men—white, black, or yellow. I can say that in California, although the slums of San Francisco do not echo the prayer. But the churches do. I believe that you do here. I believe that you will be a tower of light, casting Christian rays upon paganism—north, east, and west. It is well that the fashions of these islands should be set by Europeans. The quality of this generation is remarkably high on the whole. Birth and education do act as a protecting tariff, shutting out drones—and scoundrels. I am quite aware what the convict system did for part of Australasia. But you have packed that off. Of the effects of the system, only a remnant remains. This remnant, let us hope, will also disappear. On the whole, you impress me as a population quite able to set the fashions of the future. Sir Charles Dilke said that it was hard to find in Australia any one in an important position that did not possess more than average ability. Pioneers are picked men. Those who formed new colonies are likely to be selected by some such law as the survival of the fittest. I have been much impressed with the high average ability of men in prominent positions here. You are certainly setting high ideals before the young men whom you send to your Universities. I have looked into the examination papers of your three Universities, and I find that a man must leap a high bar before he gets a degree from any of your seats of learning.

But I am not quite satisfied with the exclusion of devotional exercises from your state schools. There seems to be a tendency towards the complete secularization of instruction. When I was in South Australia, the Bishop of Adelaide set on foot a movement to prevent the secularization of the schools, and he was met with arguments such as these: It is said there is a fear of denominational teaching. But no denominational teaching is asked for, and something, such as Bible reading and prayer, should be admitted, something that may guard against

conscience being left out. Germany put the Bible out of her schools, but the result was so bad that she put it back again. America put it out, but in several of the schools she has put it back. In New Haven, where Yale College stands, they excluded it, but the effect was so mischievous that the Bible was brought back. The schools of New Haven are now a model for all others. Now, we do not believe in denominational schools in the United States, and we do not think that devotional exercises in schools will ever open that question. That question is closed; it is, I believe, dead and buried in America, and a heavy stone has been put on its grave. And we don't want connection between Church and State. We know that a great number of children go to the Sabbath schools. They would leave all they could to the churches, but while it is said they are efficient, they are not sufficient. More than 10,000 schools are outside the Sabbath schools, and I am justified in appealing to statistics. You have separated Church and State. That is another "national" sign of the time. Let me congratulate you on the separation. Am I speaking at random? Are we sure that it will eventuate for good? Let us again appeal to reason and experience. The voluntary system will not give large salaries to curates on the country side. They will not be so well supported as upon the old plan. But your wealthy men will help those country churches. You will have missionary societies, whose officers will be able to assist those churches in the country side. I stand in this upon American experience. At the opening of this century there were only three free churches in America. Now we have only free churches there. But there has never been any very influential connection of the church with the state in America. In 1800, the proportion of the evangelical church members to the population was one in fifteen. To-day, under the voluntary system, it is one in five. There is the result, whereas some people said we would be wrecked. What do I mean by church members? I mean by it baptised persons, persons who have made a public profession of faith—nonconformist, denominational, or free church. Counting the Protestant bodies, this is exclusive of Unitarians and Universalists. It is a goodly thing to try to stand alone, for when we try to stand alone we generally succeed. The Universalist churches and preaching houses are in decay. But counting only the Evangelical churches, we have ten millions of church members to fifty millions of population. I may repeat that I am counting only those who have made serious profession of their faith. This is one of the results of the separation of Church and State. Under the voluntary system, as in America, so here, there would be a similar progress. There is nothing makes a church so to use its own possibilities as to claim and get recognition and support. It rejects all the crutches of State patronage. In America the doctrine is "sink or swim." And they mostly swim. (Applause.) Because that alternative is put before every church organization, every church that has true and lofty aims learns to swim. (Applause.) And any church that has not true and lofty aims—it ought to sink. (Applause.) A good authority says that the Evangelical churches are the orthodox. It must be so, for it is orthodoxy that pays. (Applause and laughter.) Left to itself, heterodoxy goes to the wall, thank God. (Applause.) Let those who refuse to be fettered with the Evangelical churches be reckoned, and their number is few. It is quite right that God should convert the heart of the wicked, but even the wicked must have the regard of the Church. The Evangelical churches are spread over the length and breadth of the land. Let the Universalist go out and unite with the Unitarian in certain cases. The Universalist Church is perishing for lack of spiritual life. The Unitarians are twice less numerous now than they were in 1840. The Universalists are twice and a half less numerous. I am speaking advisedly when I say this, for I have had occasion to examine the facts. There was a time when there were only two Evangelical churches of any weight. To-day there is no prominent church which is not evangelical. There are two Unitarian and Universalist churches which have some weight, but they are officered by men who are merely agents—men who have no successors in prospect. As I look round on those Universalist and Unitarian churches, I do not see where the men will come from who will take the places of those who to-day fill their pulpits. Even when a considerable part of Christianity is retained by heterodoxy, as in the case of these denominations, you may point to the earnestness of their officers and preachers if you please, but they do not create earnestness in the members. Under the voluntary system it is only the Evangelical doctrine that gives such aggressiveness as to maintain church life on a lofty plane. There is nothing more certain than that the voluntary system in church affairs merges into the aggressive action, so remarkable for its unity in Evangelical denominations. I therefore congratulate you upon the whole prospects of your separation of Church and State. I cheerfully hope you will not go back to the old plan. Having progressed so far, you should take the measures necessary to secure your position. Your rule should be to work, to learn—to work well for the success of the plan you have adopted. I congratulate you again on your acceptance of this supreme law of self-help,

I am travelling, I fear, too long over these "national" signs of the time. Among others, I ought to mention one or two which I confess give me some disquietude, as well as a glowing hope. One of the most striking is the concentration of your population in cities. I have seen fourteen cities in these Colonies, and in them about the third of the population of Australasia and Tasmania is concentrated. One quarter of the population of Victoria is gathered into her principal town. It is notorious that under the broad suffrage which you have instituted, the management of people in towns is peculiarly difficult. In America we find we can do what we please with the suffrage, where the population is virtuous. In that case the system of universal suffrage will

work well. But in the towns it is put to the test. It sometimes tends to go loose. I say these things at home. The management of great towns is a thing that representative government must provide for, or representative government itself must perish. I believe it is a long time since we permitted New York city to appoint all her own people. The police there are said to be quite previous when political affairs are uppermost. It even strains at putting down the vulture of intemperance that is consuming the heart of English speaking people. It is a new style of comment to say that the counts of this indictment are drawn up by females. We have refused to allow New York the appointment of all her own officers. We have appointed some by the vote of the whole State. New York city has 70,000 voters who cannot read or write, nearly every one of them of foreign breed. We are troubled in New York city by the broad suffrage—yet we believe in universal suffrage. We believe also in making the moral influence of the Church omnipotent, to prevent the evils that would arise out of this vote. Our population in America is also concentrating in the great cities. At the opening of this century we had one twenty-fifth of our people in the towns. We have now one fifth of our population in cities. The same state of things is produced in other places—Berlin grows faster than Germany, London faster than England, Paris faster than France. This concentration is a necessary growth, arising out of the greatly increased facilities of inter-communication. When railways have their termini in large cities, passing through intermediate towns, carrying the produce of the country to distant markets, and thus developing commerce and increasing manufactures, a large population necessarily concentrates in the towns, where commercial enterprises are common, and where manufactures are raised up. Fewer middlemen are needed when you produce goods or sell them at the centre. Hence all over the world we find the cities growing faster than the rest of the country. Under the Republic from which I come this question of the management of great cities, under a broad suffrage, is become the great question of the time. I believe you here will contribute largely to that problem, for it is being thrust upon you in its most perplexing form. Your voters are being brought from England, where they have not been accustomed to a broad suffrage. The question appears to be, whether the agricultural labourer, the manufacturing operative, the average man of a large middle class shall overcome? Will he vote here as he ought or should vote? These people have not been trained to freedom in the highest sense. Of the power of the people they will soon learn enough, but how will they use it? Will you become disgusted with them, or they with you? I know that you have government from Home, and that you have perfect freedom to do what you please, and, except the power to do wrong—(laughter)—a greater power than your fathers exerted. It would be sad if you were to set a bad example in this matter. But I hope that Australasia will set such a good example that England may copy from Australia, little by little, her improvements in their application to modern affairs. It will not do for an American like me to tell England and Scotland they must be Americanised, but they will bear to be told that they may be Australianised—that is the same thing. (Applause and laughter.) You are a government of the people, for the people, by the people, and, as an American, I am anxious that you should succeed in applying the broad suffrage to the management of municipal populations. You have not a large rural population. It will be many years before your rural population exerts any great influence in securing the purity of the vote. How then is the purity of the vote to be kept up? By the coming in of fresh blood? But you cannot rejuvenate city life in Australia in that way. There is nothing which will give you safety but a most aggressive Christianity, acting against all immoral issues of public affairs. In America the dogs would bark in the streets if the Churches took any other side than the moral side. The members of Churches are the only aristocracy left in America. There may be an aristocracy of learning, or of wealth. It is not to the aggregate that we are to look for the ideal. I do appeal most specially *to* those who have taken God's work upon themselves as divinely appointed, to enable the Church to fulfil its mission, and to take their share in the responsibility of setting the fashions both in the Church and in the State. We have found in America that the separation of Church and State does prevent the State from governing the Church, but it don't prevent the Church from governing the State. The high duty of governing these States, and calling forth a Christian population into Australia and New Zealand to your aid, is cast upon you. That duty has to be performed in view of a broad or universal suffrage, which I understand you are now debating. The Church cannot be governed by the State, but the Church can teach the State in an independent Republic that the ends of all government are the diffusion of liberty, intelligence, property, and a definite conscientiousness. The State concerns itself with liberty, intelligence, commerce, and property, but it is the supreme business of the Church to define and enforce conscientiousness. (Applause.) No one of these four things without the other three will make government upon a broad suffrage safe. Look into the future, and see your population gathered about your best river courses and your fortunately situated seaports. In Australia proper the population will cling to the coasts. In the centres, where there is but small water supply, there will be but little population. I think I see in the future an Australasian population spread out like a mighty crescent, the tips of it at Adelaide and Port Darwin, the thickness of it in Melbourne. Near this crescent will be two stars, Tasmania and New Zealand. There will be the Fijis and other stars—God knows how many you may yet annex to this crescent of the British Empire. Now you are responsible for all those who are to live within and about this crescent. God grant that you may not raise up some rashness of

municipal power that would overspread the Churches and Press of your great towns, and so cast the shadow of an eclipse for life over your scar. Allow me to say that you are performing an experiment of the utmost interest to the Western Islands of the Pacific, as well as to the North. Canada is confederate. A similar plan has been discussed at the Cape. Canada cannot maintain 100 millions of people below the line which is frozen. I believe that you cannot put into the Cape Settlements, no matter how far you extend them towards the north, as many healthy white people as you have in Australasia. Central Africa will never be colonized by whites. Only here, in these parts of the British Empire, can you put 100 millions of people. And you are to govern them under the broad suffrage. The problem is, "How to do this?" How are you to do it, unless that every man act as his brother's keeper, and with that conscientiousness of man to man which ought to belong to him who knows that he is but a sojourner on earth, while at the same time he is a citizen of a kingdom that is not of this world? I would have this discussion sink deep into your hearts, that you may be convinced of the advantages which you will derive from the solution of the problem, and those which you can extend to others. I believe that a vast population will yet be ruled from these Islands which you inhabit. Let me then consider your opportunities of being of service to neighbouring lands. I have come here from Japan. Their eyes are upon you. India watches you. I hope that your example will be imitated. Japan is a country that has made the most remarkable advances of any country within the last few years. It is only a few weeks since I was standing in Tokeo, addressing an audience made up of natives of that country, addressing them sometimes through an interpreter. They sat with the utmost patience while they heard a savage attack made on their native Buddhism. They listened to the explanation of our Christian defence. Let the great waves roll beneath your vessels, let the tall chimneys rise, or Japan will get a-head of you, and lay hold of the markets of Asia. If there should be a revolution in China, if she should shake off her feudal system, what a mighty possibility would arise! The Chinaman is not seen at his best in your coolies. If he should once look into the future, instead of croning his head to look at the moon, and follow the example of Japan; if the immense resources of his rivers, his tea fields and cotton plantations, should be once opened to the world, there indeed would be an opportunity to cast the light into the midst of the hundred millions of the celestial empire. "Look at Rome," says Gibbon, "with her 120 millions of peoples." You could affirm that you have twice that number between the Himalayas and the sea. It has been my fortune to address great assemblages of the natives of India. Their red and white turbans had an imposing appearance. Even in the fanatical town of Benares, where I addressed a large assembly, they listened to me while I attacked their Brahminical customs. These distant places will be affected in some sense by your example in the future. You will no doubt, in the course of your government, make some slips, but you will be true to the principles upon which all good government must stand. It is possible some of these Australian states may part company, but if so I hope they will part good friends. When you shall have 100 million people within your territories, I hope you will keep together even then. You have to tell the world whether it is safe to carry on representative institutions under a broad suffrage with large municipalities. If you succeed, India will be copying your administration. Mighty populations will be looking to Melbourne, to Auckland, and to Adelaide, to show them how you govern large cities. But you will never do that without saturating the public thought with aggressive Christianity. If you do so, you ought and will succeed. Apart from that aggressive Christianity, you might succeed with a despotic rule, but without it you cannot succeed under free institutions. Do Tocqueville has said, that governments need to be most critically watched when they are most democratic. The work of the Tocqueville is a most useful book, and I would recommend *every* colonist to study it. The signs of the time are above the horizon in America. Now that they are getting up to the mountain top, they are in the presence of posterity; that thought commands their earnest consideration. One of these signs is that, in the name of an aggressive Christianity, people must conquer, or not conquer at all. We must shed the light, or be in darkness ourselves. Africa is before you. They want you to shed the radiance of jurisprudence and a school of aggressive Christianity in Japan, China, and the country at the foot of the Himalayas, and in those desolate regions which we know of in Egypt, in Affghanistan, and all the lands that lie round India. You have the free institutions of North America to copy. You will be confederated here before 50 years shall have passed. You will have an increase of your responsibility when that takes place. I should desire Australasia and America, and England, and her Empire in India, to be the four sides of a mighty quadrilateral for the advancement of sound ideas in politics, and of sound doctrine in Christianity. And you will find that England, when she is sufficiently idealized, or Australianized, or Americanized—its the same thing—(laughter)—we shall have free government upon a mighty scale, influencing the whole world. I trust that I am not speaking with an improper spirit of familiarity when I say that the dearest hope of my heart is that the time is coming when the English-speaking people will not be merely a political unit but a grand political alliance, making arbitration, for instance, a substitute for warfare; having common copyright laws—well, we steal more books from you than you from us—(laughter)—but then you steal more patents from us than we from you. I would have improved copyright laws, and improved patent laws, and I would have them both international. (Applause.) I would have such an alliance as to make war impossible. I would cast the moral weight of this alliance into the scale whenever we

would be called on to arbitrate. I have even gone so far as to express a hope that the time is coming when Great Britain and the United States will be a guarantee for the neutrality of the whole Pacific Ocean. You guarantee the neutrality of the Suez Canal. America will guarantee the neutrality of the Panama Canal. Yes, gravely, I advocate making the whole Pacific Ocean neutral. I hope, too, the time will come when we can make the North Atlantic neutral, when we can put round the whole globe a white girdle of peace, until by-and-by it shall become a robe, covering the planet from head to foot.

Here I make my transition to the wider cosmopolitan aspects of my subject. Cæsar could drive his chariot round his Empire in 100 days. We can send a letter in 96 days round the whole globe. Great is the German Empire, great is the French Republic, great is the American Republic, but greater than French, American, or German is the Christian world. The Christian world is, or ought to be, so morally confederated as to be in power and substance politically *One*. You say these are fanatical ideas. Well, when the suspension bridge was to be built over Niagara Falls, the first thing they did was to send a boy's kite across the chasm. That took a thread, and again that took a wire. Then they found that they had a cable across, and at last the bridge was built, which is now the connection between east and west. (Applause.) This idea of making England and America not merely competitors but allies, this scheme of an Anglo-Saxon alliance, may now be only a question getting into a state of preparation for discussion. I am on a popular platform. I keep before the people the ideas which I feel. What I do is to carry over the thread. That may carry over something stronger, that something may carry over something stronger yet, and that the strands of a cable, until a bridge of international habitudes is erected, and the chariot-wheels of empire may pass, carrying throughout the earth universal peace. (Applause.) Your Mr. Forster is not regarded as a sentimental politician. But he once made a Speech on Now Zealand, in which he advocated such a union or alliance. He said that England ought to favour it. He feared, however, that America could not be drawn into it in consequence of the doctrine of avoiding entangling alliances. I have great respect for Washington's advice to avoid entangling alliances. What have we been doing? We have called a convention—a very proper and useful thing on our side of the globe—for the purpose of considering such treaties as should be rediscussed, as well as to make arbitration the rule for determining national differences, instead of war, and so decide the settlement of international disputes. Two important cases have occurred. Once we had an arbitration when you did not believe in it. Once you had an arbitration when America did not believe in it. But let us eat humble pie when it is necessary. I remember once being in Mr. Spurgeon's study, when he showed me with great glee two essays, which he said he highly valued. What do you think they were? well, one was "Bull on Bragging," and the other was "Jonathan on Exaggeration." (Laughter.) This points a moral, and shows how both nations may eat humble pie to do them good. I say let us both be Christian first, and English and American afterwards. Let us give a stern account to the people how we act in matters which involve the issues of war. Let us take by the throat and break the neck of any political power that will not submit to Christian laws. It is high time that a Christian internationalism of this kind should be established. Let all Christian men feel themselves called upon to check the growth of any power that would bring about the horrors of an unjust war. (Applause.) Mr. Bright said he felt obliged to resign his seat in the English Cabinet, because it was "a precious doctrine to him that the moral law applied to the relations of nations as well as to individuals." Mr. Gladstone, in his reply, said, "The right hon. gentleman and myself have no debate about the general principle. We differ only as to the application of the principle to the affairs of Egypt." Here is a recognition of what I call the "higher law." Mr. Gladstone himself lifts it up as the law of the British Empire. Mr. Bright holds it up as the law of a higher authority and a wider kingdom. America will lift up this higher law. Let it be raised above American constitutions, above British enactments of every kind, of every province, of every nation—make it the supreme law to be recognised in our international arrangements—make Christendom united in sustaining this law as a supreme guide for nations. When that is done, there will be a Christian internationalism with which every other power will have to reckon. God speed, I say, the growth of that Christian internationalism, that shall make this law a recognised force, whether national or provincial. It results from the fact that there would be no foreign lands in our time. The cause of free institutions, the cause of free education, the cause of Christianity, would be, not for the benefit of some or many, but for all; whatever good cause comes to the front in our time must be regarded as cosmopolitan in all its possible relations to the future. Let the free institutions of the West, and here in Australasia, proceed until they go through all Asia ultimately; let the grand views of education adopted in Germany, or the United States, or the British Empire, be taught in China and Japan. Let Christianity succeed in the high places of the West, and it will be sure to succeed in the dark places of the earth. War in one place is war for the whole earth. We must regard ourselves denizens of this planet, as well as citizens of a vast republic. We will act in both capacities, when we are also citizens of one great theocracy. I wish to impress on this audience that no nation can be secure without a law of this kind. There is no security in isolation. You can send a letter home in 40 days from Sydney. It is immaterial which way it goes, in 40 or 45 days it is at the river Thames. Look at the globe then so rapidly encircled. How can Paganism maintain itself on its mental seclusion? They will sooner or later follow Japan, in opening their ports

to commerce, to civilisation, and when they are thus accessible it will be impossible to remain in the mental isolation of the false creeds of Asia." You encircle the globe in 90 days. Cæsar could only circuit the Roman Empire in 100 days. Do not think I am underrating the dignity of the Roman Empire and its ruler. If Cæsar were alive in these days he would be cosmopolitan. What was the ambition of the Greeks, who conquered empire, to that which would conquer the earth, for the reign of the kingdom of God? What should our ambition be, if we are to match those who threw paganism off its hinges? Our ambition should be worldwide. The early bishops used to begin their missions with the words *Sursum corda*—"Raise up your hearts." The chief signs of the time now is, that there can be no foreign land, all men belong to one family, to be taught by the Word of God.

Will you allow me, as I part from you, to think with you aloud? There is more cheap printing in the world than ever before. There is also more cheap thinking. Small philosophers are great characters in half-learned ages. Such is the age in which we live. What are we doing, but carrying over a multitude from no culture to half-culture but whom we hope to lift from that condition when they come to think for themselves. In this transitional period there will be much unrest. There will be a hundred questioners, each of whom will ask as many questions, and won't take the majority as an authority. Their minds are filled with their own conceit and narrow reasoning upon real or imagined grievances. A man is a man if his father were rich; a man is a man though he were cleverer than his fellows, or not so clever; a man is a man though poor and distressed; and a man is a man though he went to a university. But, (rod be praised, little by little men are helping to think for themselves. When they shall have learned a good deal there will be a good deal less of this unrest. Let us not be too much disturbed by the diseases peculiar to the childhood of a people. Populations, like young boys, must go through the measles. There is a teething time for societies as well as babes. In American colleges there are fresh men, and sophisters, and the fresh man who goes first to college thinks he knows more than the sophister, or than he is likely to know 20 years after. In my state of Massachusetts there are more small philosophers than in any other. You must not laugh at her too much, for there are many in the other states also. I find that it is this transitional state of unrest that accounts for much of the so-called infidelity that we see around. But I believe that there are less infidel scholars in our age than in any of the previous ages. Compared with a time of high learning at the French Revolution, the comparison is very favorable to the present age. I believe that Christianity to-day stands upon an advanced ground that she never possessed before or since the patriarchal age. There is a great deal of vulgar infidelity, that makes a noise, because printing is cheaper than before. But that is more a sign of audacity than real strength. The question is, "What is the relative power of infidelity and Christianity?" Suppose I measure on this table five hands'-breadth for fifteen centuries. Now, in that space of time, Christianity gained fifteen millions. If I mark off three centuries between the Reformation and 1800, we find that Christianity gained in that time one hundred millions. If we take from 1800 to 1882, what do we find? We find that Christianity has gained, in these eighty-two years, two hundred and ten millions. There are now four hundred and ten millions of Christians in the world. Of that number, two hundred and ten millions have been gained during this present century—that is, more in this century than in the previous eighteen centuries. Do you ask, Where do you get these figures from? I answer, From a dozen quarters—from Germany, from America, and other places. They will be found in a work issued by Dr. Dorchester, of Boston, compiled with great care from authentic records—"The Problem of Christian Progress." I have shown a copy of it to several gentlemen. It is well illustrated with diagrams, showing the outcome of his statistical investigations. And what is it? The great fact is, that to-day we have thrice the number of adherents to Christianity on the globe as compared with the beginning of this century. So mighty has been the advance of gospel truth, so powerful have been the efforts of missions, so great has been the Evangelical movement inside the nominal Christian population. And what do I mean by adherents? I mean, not merely the subjects of Christian governments. I mean baptised and confirmed persons, persons who are themselves supporters of a Christian church, men who come to the communion service. Now, these facts are extraordinary. I bring them forward to show the rate of progress that has been made. You must take, not the absolute, but the relative powers of these forces. At the opening of this century there were 50 translations of the Bible, now it is to be seen printed in 308 languages. At that date, £50,000 was spent for missions, to-day the sum is £1,700,000. And this sum has rapidly increased from year to year, and is increasing. There is a Bible in circulation for every ten men on this planet. There are millions who regularly read the Bible, that never read it before. In Japan, in China and India, there are several self-supporting Christian churches. This is a fact not generally known as regards China, and not widely understood as regards Japan. I am informed that it will be immediately in our power to bring a knowledge of the Gospel to every human being, by placing a copy of this Book in his hand. Standing in the presence of this triumph of Christianity, you may talk as you please of cheap printing and thinking. The truth is that infidelity is now very far less powerful than it was in the days of Voltaire and Lord Bolingbroke. And if Christianity was mighty when giants were opposed to it, if it was powerful enough while in its babyhood to take the Roman Empire by the neck and throw it to the earth, if it has come to its present colossal power, what should it have to fear from pigmy enemies? Christianity is not now a new thing in the world. Its vindication is that it works well,

while infidelity works ill. Wherever infidelity has been seen in the veins of nations, you have there diseases which eclipse the mind as well as the conscience. In this Book there is the evidence which proves it to be divine, and shewing the lofty destiny of the human race, if they obey the commandments of God. Oh, but some one says, what about the external and internal evidence? The external evidence is adduced by the greatest scholars of the age. And if you want internal evidence, let us take a loaf for instance. The external evidence is derived from the maker, the quality and quantity of the material, and if you want the internal evidence, any sensible man will tell you that there is a shorter method of proof than a small philosopher would suggest—that is, "eat it, and see whether it is good." (Loud applause.) Without any fear whatever of the contradiction of the opponents of Christianity, we may affirm that whenever the pure bread of Christianity has been absorbed into the veins of nations—not merely taken, into the lips, but absorbed undiluted into the veins—there you see a health and stalwartness that cannot be seen anywhere else in history. These broad facts are *supremo* facts. I know how often it is insisted on that they are commonplace, because they are important and trite; because they are close to our own inquiry. But look at the so-called sacred books of the religions of the East, and you will see that they contain a great deal more of irreligion than French infidelity or modern schemes of atheistic tendency. When the poisonous lymph of the book of Mahomet is absorbed into the body politic, it breaks out into the ulcers of polygamy. Where the system of Confucius has had sway, it leaves a nation stunted, without any moral loftiness, without enthusiasm. Take the sacred books of the Hindoo, and you understand at once how a nation can be paralysed with caste. Buddhism leads the nation that feeds upon its precepts into a state of prolonged childhood. Only this book, the Bible which I now hold in my hand, produces that healthiness, that stalwartness of the mental and moral life which goes to the completion of man's nature, which gives him hope in the future, and releases from the darkness of ignorance. The proof of its divineness is to be found in the divineness of the mighty facts it records. I do not underrate the external evidences of Christianity. De Wette, who was called a universal doubter, said there may be a mystery connected with the manner of the Resurrection, but as to the fact of the Resurrection, there can no more be a particle of doubt than there can be a doubt about the historical evidence of the assassination of Cæsar. Over this admission, Neander, the great historian of the Church, shed tears of *joy*. It is well known, although the authors of all the concessions which have been made in favour of Christianity cannot be brought face to face, that there never was an hour when the historical evidences of Christianity stood on a stronger basis than the present. The historical evidence proves the Resurrection, the Resurrection proves the divinity of Christ, and the purity, the loftiness, the holiness of Christ's doctrines are proofs in themselves. The Divinity of Christ proves the certainty of the fulfilment of prophecy, the immortality of the soul of man, the atonement and eternal judgment. There is a legion of external evidences of Christianity on that side of her defences. She has stood the test of ages, and has never been defeated. If we place the internal evidences over against the external evidences, as one side of an arch over against the other, with Christ the keystone there, we find the truth, against which the rage of infidelity cannot prevail. The philosophers of doubt have been unable to move the solidity of the arch. The facts have been investigated by the most patient and industrious scholarship, which is at length able to cast upon the pretensions of those opponents of Christianity a look of mingled scorn and pity.

I shall not pause longer on the wretched schemes of infidelity, on both sides of the Atlantic, or refer to their vulgar aspects in England or America. But this cheap printing-has led up to an infamous form of publication, against which it is necessary to put Christian people on their guard. Certain persons have been petitioning Congress for the abolition of those postal regulations which prohibit the passing of certain obscene and infamous publications through that State establishment. You all know the character of these publications, for two persons have been indicted on account of them in Great Britain, Who are the friends of these books it is not necessary to inquire, but we have had two cases of imprisonment for sending these infamous books. These books are sent to seminaries and schools for young women, until I know of cases where the conductors of these establishments have informed me that they cannot publish the names of their pupils for fear they should be subjected to an outrage of this kind. I believe this happens on both sides of the Atlantic. Persons of the description I have referred to, whenever they can get the names of the pupils in these schools, address one or more of these infamous publications to these names, and so obtain a circulation for their abominable writings in this way. This is no imaginary description. The facts are known to me, and I shall mention an instance that there may be no mistake upon the matter. Mr. H. F. Durant, one of our foremost lawyers, founded a great school for young ladies at Wellesley. He told me that the reason he did not allow a Year Book, with the names of his pupils in it, to be published, was this one, that certain persons sent infamous papers into the school in this way. I would have known nothing about this if it had not been my business to make inquiries. You see then that the signs of the times are above and underground. The editor of one of these infidel papers in New York was sent to goal by a judge and jury, who are not apt to be very squeamish or sentimental people. When he came out of gaol certain of his friends tried to lionize him. One of our monthlies—"Scribner's," now the "Century"—was applied to in aid of the demonstration, but they flatly refused to have anything to do with it, and designated the

whole thing as the "Apotheosis of Dirt." When I was at Bombay, the Theosophists of that city tried to lionize him, but nobody noticed him or them, and he came to one of my lectures, I am told, carrying a horse whip—which he did *not* use. (Applause and laughter.) All along the road that man went before me, attacking Christianity, but it is not from such assaults that Christianity takes hurt. The work of infidels must still be measured by their acts, and the acts of those who aid them. Colonel Ingersoll put his name to the petition which I have spoken of, for the abolition of postal regulations against the conveyance of infamous prints. It is a Congressional document, and having been publicly read, it can be referred to publicly. The effect of the change, if it had been granted, would have been to flood the country with infamous books. But Congress replied, "The post office has not been established for any such infamous purpose." (Loud Applause.) I know that Colonel Ingersoll afterwards made the excuse that when he signed that petition he did not know what he was about, and that he signed in ignorance of what was meant. I understand that he has caused his name to be withdrawn from that movement. But foremost among those lodges of infidels, half a dozen men with long hair, and an equal number of women in short hair, and about 120 altogether, went for that petition. But there is a change for the worse, if that be possible, among the infidel ranks. Now, infidels are immoral and connected with immoral enterprises, and directly or indirectly concerned with paganism and immorality. This can be proved by their records. When you see a public paper or print in support of "Free Love," flashing its fangs in the post office boxes, you would see it dragged forth, and I am sure you would hail with a righteous public indignation the power that should crush the head and fangs of it. I may say here that there is no learned infidelity in America. Theodore Parker and Emerson were universalists or unitarians, or conservative unitarians. Parker's church has fallen into decay, and Mr. Frothingham, his successor, has not been able to revive it. Parkerism denies that there has been any supernaturalism. It was said of him that he was an out and out anti-supernaturalist. Some claimed for him a doctrine of "conservatism," and an admission of a "revelation." But he was never an evangelical Christian in any sense. There is a single fact concerning his books which may be mentioned here. There is no collected edition of his works in America. I asked a leading publisher in Boston whether that was so, and he said, "It was so." I asked him how it was so, and he said, "Well, it would end in failure. I know there is not a shilling to be got out of them." That is a financial fact, but it has a theological bearing. (Applause and laughter.) Then as to Emerson. He was a Unitarian. He was called a "pantheist," but in 1875 he said himself, "I am a Christian Theist." Lastly, in order to allay some doubt upon the matter, he said, "I call myself a Christian." He was, beyond any question, a believer in the personal immortality of the soul. He was supposed to be something like a "conservative," but he said, "No, I am Christian, and when I am gone I hope the word 'Christian' will not be left out of my designation." To live according to it is to believe it, and I must give Emerson credit for his own claim on this point. (Applause.) At his grave was sung a verse—

*There is no death,
What seems so is transition of this life,
Immortality is the sphere of higher life
"Whose portals we call "Death."*

Emerson and Longfellow were both called "conservative," but I never heard Emerson claimed under that designation, except by Longfellow. Whittier is one of the devoutest of Quakers, and Lowell is also one of the most devout men living. William Cullen Bryant was also the most devout of men. It has been a blessing to American literature that infidelity was never attached to its leading writers. There is no such foolishness in the leading minds of America. Looking round the world, I find there is no book which has not been put on the shelf by scholars when it came in competition with this one—the Bible. (Applause.)

Let me speak now as to the attitude of Christian scholarship face to face with learned infidelity in the world wherever it has appeared. Let us first take the New Testament, and see how that stands. Eighty years ago it was thought that, as a work of divine authority, these writings could not be dated earlier than the year 180. First there came Strauss, who said that between the Crucifixion and that date there was time for all kinds of myth to grow round that event. No doubt we must account for the New Testament. Strauss and Hume said everything relating to "miracles" must be an exaggeration. No doubt there is a history of the events which occurred immediately before and immediately after Christ's death. It was alleged, as almost certain, that myths would grow up in connection with the founder of the Christian dispensation and his apostles and disciples, and 180 years would be ample for a plentiful crop of them. Many scholars were annoyed by this theory, and most of the ablest scholars repudiated it. I have no doubt that many of you now remember when you were young that the attack of Strauss was considered a great assault upon Christianity. But we have seen since then much higher authorities upon historic evidence. We have seen its death and burial. It died even before the death of its author. In the last book written by Strauss, he confesses that his mythical theory had been buried before him. Now if I

succeed in fastening upon your mind the great facts that the most erudite scholarship of the present day admits, my coming here to-day will not be altogether unprofitable. The whole of the subjects connected with the writings of St. Paul and the synoptical Gospels have been thoroughly investigated. The highest scholarship, men of diverse opinions in other respects, have arrived at the conclusion that the "Four Epistles" of Paul are as early as the year 60. Now that shuts out the later date (180) altogether from consideration. As to the actual date of the Crucifixion, there is a divergence of opinion covering two or three years. There is a doubt to that extent as to the date, but none as to the fact. Some scholars assign it to the year 31, others 34, but most scholars fix it at 34. Now we know that Paul suffered under Nero. It is well known when Nero died. Jerusalem was taken by Titus in the year 70. We have the Colosseum at Rome, and the Arch of Titus in Rome, which testify as to this fact. Their testimony is tolerably distinct. The Colosseum shows that it was begun in the year 12, and that there the captives taken at Jerusalem were exhibited. Then there is the Arch of Titus showing upon it the sacred utensils, such as the candlestick and altar vessels. There is no doubt about them. They cannot be mistaken. Nero, we know, died in the year 68. We know, therefore, that the Epistles of Paul must have been written before 68. Festus and Felix we know had certain relations to Judea, and we can fix the time pretty nearly when Paul appeared before them. We know that when a certain succession occurred it occurred before the war. Those and other historic evidences go to show that the Epistles were written as early as the year 60, some of them as early as the year 58. It is now admitted by Bauer and Renan that these were written before Co., and that the Epistle to the Galatians was probably written as early as the year 54. This is the testimony of men who are, in some sense, among* the defenders of infidelity. Now, Paul himself says that he knew a man who, 14 years before, went up, into Jerusalem, where he heard the Gospels read. We know that Paul sojourned for three years in Arabia. Now take these 17 years (14 and 3) from 54, and you have the year 37, just within three years of the Crucifixion. Thus the doctrine of Strauss and infidelity has been cut into shreds. (Loud applause.) We now see, upon indubitable historic evidence, that the antiquity of the four Gospels can be referred back nearly to the death of Our Lord. There can no longer be any doubt as to the date of the synoptical Gospels. But what does this evidence show? It shows two mighty facts: It shows that very shortly after the Crucifixion there was a set Christian organization in existence, reaching from Jerusalem to Antioch. It shows, as plain as any evidence could show it, that certainly within 20 years of the Crucifixion one set doctrine was received by this organization as of Divine Authority. There can be no mistake whatever on the point. Anybody who reads the records of the time must be convinced that this doctrine was the doctrine set forth in these Gospels. The Resurrection is everywhere mentioned, and St. Paul mentions that there were in his time 250 persons "yet alive, who saw Our Lord after the Crucifixion." Now, to whom does Paul say this? He says it to the Churches, at a distance from Jerusalem, to whom the fact must have been known. You must remember that he wrote the Epistle at Rome. Do you say that he was deceived, that he was the dupe of others? There were no printed books in those times. But the writers had amanuensis who made copies of their writings, so that every copy had a living witness behind it. You are belated and benighted if you think there is any infidelity that dares to face the compact body of evidence that can now be adduced to support the claims of Christianity. The German Universities, which may be described as the thermometer of modern philosophy, had enough of infidelity 50 years ago, but the scholars who 50 years ago were prominently infidel, are now evangelical and theological. I happen to know a great many of the young men at present attending the German Universities. And I know the fact, that the young men of the Universities are now giving their time to evangelical and theological teachers, in the proportion of ten to one. Heidelberg has seven philosophical teachers, but a very small number of students. Look, on the other hand, at the patronage given by the young men to Halle, to Berlin, and Leipsic. I stood with Baroness Stowe lately, at the grave of my own excellent teacher, a man of truly evangelical spirit. Halle has from 200 to 300 evangelical pupils, Berlin has from 300 to 400 evangelical pupils. Leipsic has from 400 to 500 evangelical and theological pupils. These signs are significant, as showing me what the highest scholarship has decided, and that high scholarship is on the side of Christianity. The best and most authoritative opinion upon questions of critical scholarship, like everything else, will find the widest support. The opinion of the public is enforced by the fact that the young men of Germany are giving their patronage 10 to 1 to the best commentators on the Old and New Testament, and the best works on that subject written in more than one language. The signs of the time show the personal advancement of enlightened opinion in this matter, as well as the national progress of opinion on the side of Christianity. The future destinies of the world are bound up with the fortune of Christianity. The Word of God is pledged to* it in prophecy. That word is justified by the chosen men upon the earth. These men shall become a chosen people. His Church will be made up of these chosen people, making a family. This family shall become a chosen nation, who shall send forth a chosen band of religious teachers, to found a church in every land, and make the earth rejoice with the glory of His name, for these teachers will occupy every part of this entire planet. The prospect is grand beyond description. The seed is sown, the grain grows, and the stream of human history flows on, but this is a movement proceeding out of the heart of God. He has been acting for thousands of years, and do you think he will not continue to act as before?

Will He cease from the work He is doing and has done? Do not be troubled with any anxiety that God will change the plan upon which he has been acting for three thousand years. Almighty God has given to us, and to all the children of man, His Holy Spirit and counsel, and His only Son, Immanuel, Prince of Peace. My cheeks grow white with solemn feeling when I look to the facts of fulfilled prophecy, to its constant and consistent growing. I separate from you now through the force of circumstances. My personal creed, I should like to have it written on my tombstone, though the grass grow green upon it—"The Word of God shall be fulfilled, the presence of God is over all the earth, the will of our Father shall be done in all lands, and by all people." (Loud and prolonged applause.)

The rev. lecturer concluded his discourse by reciting a series of verses, and pronounced the benediction in a most impressive manner, after which the large assemblage separated.

vignette

Orthodoxy Unmasked; Clerical Arguments Refuted: An Open Reply and Appendix to the Last Letter of the Rev. J. A. Dowie, Recently Published. By Thomas Walker Published by Thomas Walker, and for Sale by the Booksellers. 1882,

Introduction.

THE present pamphlet is published as an appendix to that published by the Rev. J. A. Dowie a few weeks ago, and entitled "Spiritualism Unmasked." His pamphlet contains our correspondence prior to the letter which now appears in this present form. This letter is simply a reply to the last letter of the rev. gentleman, and, as such, ought to have appeared in the pamphlet containing the previous correspondence. The reason why it did not do so is made clear on page 17, where it will be seen that it was the unfair decision of the Rev. John Alexander Dowie and his friends that any further reply of mine should be excluded from the correspondence. As it is seldom that a wrong is done without the doers of it being able to invent and believe some kind of justification for it, in this case it was attempted to justify the wrong by the assumption that my rev. opponent had the right to have the last word. To this must be added the fear of too great cost of publication, and the dread of the correspondence becoming interminable. As to the cost of publication, I may mention that I pointed out to the Rev. Mr. Dowie and his friend, Dr. Singleton, that that need not deter them from doing me justice, since I would bear the entire cost of publication myself rather than allow the correspondence to appear incomplete, or his letter to appear without its refutation. The argument as to the correspondence becoming interminable, and therefore that I have no right to reply to his attacks upon me and others, is too absurd upon the face of it to require serious refutation. His only plea of justification for his conduct, therefore, resolves itself into his assumed right of reply. The answer to this is to be found in the pamphlet which he himself has published. It is only necessary for the reader to make a comparison of the letters therein to perceive that the right of reply—to have the last say—is indisputably mine. His pamphlet contains about 50 pages of correspondence and 22 pages of introduction, and the space allotted to me in all the pamphlet does not amount to a total of 18 pages. This, on the face of it, has a show of unfairness; but it is necessary to analyze the letters themselves to make the unfairness fully self-evident. Observe then:—

- The letters of his and mine up to 11th February simply discuss the merits and demerits of my challenge to him.
- His letter of 13th February was the first essentially controversial letter. In this he makes an attack upon me and others.
- My letter of 20th February was a reply to this attack.
- His letter of 18th March was a renewal of the attack. It not only repeats his old charges, and consequently re-opens the correspondence, but it introduces a number of fresh topics for discussion, and notably among these, the question of the causes of the French Revolution and the general views and character of A. J. Davis.
- According to him, I must not—nay, I have no right to—reply to this renewed attack with so many reinforcements, but I must submit like a martyr and bear it in silence!

What a splendid general the Rev. J. A. Dowie would make if he could only get his enemies to believe him. He would burn the cities of his foes, ruin their homes and hopes, and then insist that they had no right whatever to say a word or take up arms against him.

It may be asked why this letter appears alone, and why I do not republish the whole of the correspondence? Chiefly because of the expense that such a course would inevitably incur; and since I endorse the general accuracy of the previous correspondence as published by the Rev. J. A. Dowie, I thought it unnecessary to republish it here. That correspondence is now in the hands of the public, and, so far as it goes, I endorse it; but it requires *this* letter to make it complete. Hence I publish this *brochure* as an appendix to it.

There may be some, however, who will read this letter who have not read those previously published. For the sake of such it is, perhaps, advisable that I enter into a brief explanation of the origin of the correspondence in the first place. Happening one day to meet Mr. Strachan, who had had some conversation with the Rev. J. A. Dowie upon the subject of Spiritualism, I asked him if he thought that rev. gentleman was ready to defend his own beliefs, as he seemed so ready to attack the beliefs of others. Mr. Strachan did not know whether or not he was as ready to act on the defensive as he was on the offensive, so I asked him kindly to write to the Rev. J. A. Dowie and ascertain. For that purpose I worded these propositions:—

- Resolved—that Orthodoxy is conducive to Morality and Progress; and
- Resolved—that Infidelity is conducive to Morality and Progress.

The former of these it was intended he should affirm, whilst I should affirm the latter.

The Rev. J. A. Dowie, instead of answering the questions of Mr. Strachan, chose very naturally to inquire first from whom the challenge to discuss these subjects came. Then Mr. Strachan referred the rev. gentleman to me for an answer. This inaugurated the correspondence. The preliminary letters were simply upon the point as to whether a discussion should be held or not, and if so, what would be the best subject for discussion. The attack or defence of our particular views was not introduced, since the proper place for such, in the event of a discussion being brought about, would be the public platform. It soon became evident, however, that my clerical opponent had no desire to meet me publicly, and leaving the point at issue—the advisability of a discussion—he commenced in his letter of the 13th of February an attack, not upon *my* views, not upon the views I had declared myself ready to defend, in fact not upon the views of anyone, but upon views which he himself had manufactured by perverting the statements and misrepresenting the opinions of others.

Although I was anxious to avoid entering upon any subject not involved in the wording of the propositions of my challenge to him, I felt it incumbent upon me, in the simple interests of justice, to reply to his calumnious charges, to correct his many misstatements, and to state the truth upon the points he had mooted. These things I did in my letter of 20th February, and at this stage I was perfectly willing to have the correspondence published.

I say I was perfectly willing to have the correspondence published; for, before my opponent had received that letter, he had already entered into some arrangements for having the preceding letters published. He had not said a word to me about it, nor acquainted me, directly or indirectly, in the slightest degree, with his intentions. After receiving my letter, however, of 20th February, he was silent for some weeks; so, bearing in mind the fact that he had intended publishing *before* he had received it, I wrote a note to him on 13th March, informing him that *I* intended publishing the correspondence, *unless* he replied further. Of course, had he objected to the publication of his letters, I should not have carried out my intention to publish them at that stage. And it must be remembered, too, that my first step, after forming the intention, was to acquaint him with it—not, as he did, to make partial preparations for its being carried out. It is evident, however, that he did not wish the correspondence published at that stage; for, after informing me of his intention, he re-opened the correspondence in the letter to which this now published is a reply.

When the Rev. J. A. Dowie called upon me to gain my consent to the publication of the correspondence in its uncompleted stage, I strongly protested against such a proceeding being carried into effect. He informed me, however, that his mind and the minds of his friends were made up upon the point, and that they were fully determined to publish the correspondence as it then stood, whether I gave my consent or not. It was only left to me, therefore, to inform the rev. gentleman that if he did so I should be obliged to denounce the publication as soon as it appeared, both from my Sunday evening platform at the Opera House, and through the columns of the daily press. When his version of the correspondence appeared therefore, I was obliged to characterize the pamphlet as it deserved, and as I had informed my opponent that I would.

In the columns of the *Age* and *Telegraph* for Saturday, 22nd April, I placed an advertisement which I wrote and published for the express purpose of guarding the public from his statements and his version of the correspondence; and in the faith, mistaken or otherwise, that desperate diseases require stringent remedies, I, as I am firmly convinced, and as I can adduce abundance of evidence to show, designated his production in language perfectly truthful, though admittedly strong. Strong as the words were, however, I felt that I could not protect the public by any milder terms at my command.

Early in the following week appeared a letter from his pen, published in the above two papers. In that letter, after attempting to justify his conduct, and making several serious misstatements, he called upon me to publicly apologize for the publication of my advertisement. A day or so after he sent me the worded form of an apology which he demanded I should sign, since anything "short of that [he] would not accept." Legal proceedings for a criminal libel were threatened if I refused to do this, and to accompany it with several acts of ignominious humiliation. I positively refused to do anything of the kind, since I was, and am, perfectly convinced that my advertisement was not only necessary, but perfectly just, under existing circumstances.

On his receipt of my refusal to apologize, he at once took legal proceedings, though, instead of taking the matter into the Supreme Court, as he threatened that he probably would, he contented himself with a claim for

damages to the extent of £250, as the equivalent—is it fair to suppose?—of his alleged loss of reputation, in consequence of the publication of my advertisement.

It was my original intention to go through his introduction to his pamphlet as I have gone through his last letter, and, after dissecting it thoroughly, to correct all its perversions, misrepresentations, and matters foreign to the truth; but as such a course would necessarily reveal my points of defence in the forthcoming trial at the County Court to be held in Melbourne on the 7th of June, I must refrain, and simply content myself with designating his introduction as a tissue of perversions. This I am happily able to prove, not only by an appeal to the internal evidence of the introduction itself, but by the testimony of witnesses of unimpeachable veracity.

Knowing that this letter would be published, I have done what I could to make it as generally interesting as my abilities would allow. I have aimed at imparting such information as would be not only valuable to the Rev. J. A. Dowie, but to general readers desirous of gaining knowledge upon the points which have been discussed. If the perusal of this letter, therefore, will supply the working men, who have not time for laborious and extensive reading, with facts and arguments by means of which they maybe enlisted in the army of reform and progress, made free from their superstitions, and rendered more happy and contented with the lot of life, my labour will not have been in vain, even should the Rev. J. A. Dowie remain impervious to common-sense. With the hope, then, that my letter may be fairly read,

I remain, dear reader, yours truly,
THOS. WALKER.

May 10th, 1882.

Introduction.

Part II.

Since writing the previous portion of this introduction, the case of Dowie v. myself came on for hearing before Judge Cope and a special jury of four, and the result is now well known, at least, to the Melbourne public. We have obtained a victory and shown mercy to our opponent. The plaintiff's case was so weak that when it was opened in the court on Monday, the 19th of this month, it had to be adjourned till Thursday, to enable him and his legal assistants to strengthen it as far as they were able. The truth of this will be seen by reading the following report from the *Age* of Tuesday the 20th inst, headed:—

A Curious Action for Libel.

At the County Court yesterday, before Judge Cope and a special jury of four, the case of Dowie v. Walker was heard. This was an action brought by the Rev. John Alexander Dowie, at present minister of Mr. Cherbury's Tabernacle, against Mr. Thomas Walker, the well-known freethought lecturer, to recover £250 damages for alleged libel. Mr. Hood appeared for the plaintiff, and Mr. Purves for the defendant. In opening the case to the jury Mr. Hood said the libel complained of had appeared in The Age newspaper of the 22nd April last, and was as follows:—

"SPIRITUALISM UNMASKED.—Published Without My Reply.—I publicly denounce the correspondence published by the Rev. J. A. Dowie, under the above heading, as a malicious and one-sided production. It is published without my reply to his last letter, and in defiance of my most decided objections. The introduction abounds in malevolent falsehoods and misrepresentations, and is consequently a disgrace to any one who would pass for a gentleman.—THOS. WALKER, Melbourne, April 21st."

He (Mr. Hood) said that he would content himself with proving only the publication of the libel, and would afterwards, if he found it necessary, call his witnesses for a rebutting case. He was bound to conduct the case in that way because the defendant had not pleaded justification or anything else, and he was at a loss to know how they were going on with their action. The print, as his Honor would see, was a direct libel.

His Honor: What is the language complained of?

Mr. Purves: That is what I want to know.

Mr. Hood: It is in the advertisement.

Mr. Purves: But I am going to raise the point that there is no libel.

Mr. Hood: How can you do that?

Mr. Purves: Chief Justice Hale held that if a man called another a fool it is no libel because he is as his

Maker made him.

Mr. Hood: But his Maker did not make him a liar.

Mr. Purves: Perhaps Satan did.

Mr. Hood: We've nothing here to prove that; I will now call Mr. Robert Walker.

Mr. Purves: He is a member of Parliament.

Mr. Hood: Hut he has a right to come here whether he is a member of Parliament or not.

Mr. Purves: But you can't expect a member of Parliament to tell the truth, can you?

Mr. Hood: You have been one and ought to know; I have not been one.

Mr. Purves: But you've tried mighty hard.

Mr. Robert Walker, editor of the Daily Telegraph, was called hut did appear.

Mr. Hood: I'll then call Mr. Davis of The Age.

Mr. Purves; He does not appear.

His Honor: Try someone else.

Mr. Purves: Try Smith, or Jones or Brown.

Mr. Hood: I'll ask your Honor to adjourn the case to enable us to have the attendance of these witnesses.

Mr. Purves: Why don't you act like a man, and call your client.

Mr. Hood: Because I prefer to conduct my own case. Does Mr. Purves admit the publication? I would ask your Honor to make Mr. Purves state his case.

Mr. Purves: I am sure your Honor won't attempt to play a practical joke of this kind on me. My learned friend has not opened his case, but has split it up, and having done that he can't ask me to open my hand.

Mr. Hood: We don't know what your defence is.

Mr. Purves: We don't Admit the publication, and replead not guilty and fair comment.

His Honor: Is it mere accident that the witnesses are away?

Mr. Hood: Yes. Both have been subpoenaed, but each evidently thought the case would not be called on to-day.

Mr. Purves: If my learned friend would put his reverend client into the witness-box I'll admit the publication.

His Honor: That is fair.

Mr. Hood: I know my learned friend well. He will get my witnesses into the box, and then call none himself.

Mr. Purves: Perhaps I might; but I want to have a quiet conversation with the rev. gentleman—the parson; and we might just as well have it first as last.

Mr. Hood: I'll ask your Honor to adjourn.

James Davis then came into court. He stated that he was formerly in the employment of the Age, and had received the advertisement complained of from an agent.

Mr. Purves: What has that to do with the case? It is putting the cart before the horse, and is no evidence against the defendant.

The witness was then withdrawn, and at the suggestion of his Honor the jury was also withdrawn, and the case postponed until Thursday next.

Mr. Purves: Of course we'll get our costs.

Mr. Hood: They'll be all right.

Mr. Purves: I would ask your Honor to let us have them. We don't know Dowie. He is merely a waif and stray, and has given his address as at the Coffee Palace. We can seize nothing there. He is a wanderer and a waif, and I daresay when he went to the Coffee Palace he took all his effects with him in a little bag.

His Honor: I can hardly do that.

Mr. Purves: But these rev. gentlemen are supposed to have no scrip or purse. (Laughter.) The costs are £4 4s 6d., and X understand they are allowed us.

His Honor: Yes.

The case was then adjourned until Thursday next.

When the case was re-entered upon on Thursday, although they had subpoenaed several new witnesses who appeared in court, their evidence was still so weak that the only way in which they could connect me with the publication of the advertisement complained of was by an incorrect assertion of the plaintiff's solicitor's clerk. His Honor, however, whilst granting my counsel leave to move for a non-suit, considered this sufficient to allow the case to go to the jury.

Mr. Hood, who ably conducted the weak case for his reverend client, manifested from the very commencement, as will have been seen from the above report, an invincible determination not to put his client into the box. The reason for this need not be looked for far. Had the Rev. John Alexander Dowie borne a good character, and possessed an unsullied reputation, his evidence would have been not only of exceeding great value to enable the jury to decide upon the merits of the case, but in the natural course of fair-play it would

have been voluntarily offered. But since "a guilty conscience needs no accuser," the plaintiff wisely selected to remain at the right arm of his orthodox solicitor, peeping out upon the scene, as a timid chicken looks out upon danger through the wings of the parent hen. Every now and again when Mr. Purves manifested a too close knowledge of his private life, he allowed startled ejaculations to escape him, and could not forbear offering insults to my counsel.

During the time I was in the box, after Mr. Purves, by examination, had elicited the facts contained in the previous part of this Introduction, the rev. gentleman, through his counsel, thought to give me a stab, from which, judging by an expression that escaped him on leaving the court, and another that he made from his pulpit on the following Sunday, he had hoped I should not recover. He had obtained a copy of the *Medium and Daybreak*, a rag professing to advocate Spiritualism, published by a substitute for a man in London, England. I will quote the passage here, that the reader may see to what despicable and contemptible depths of malignity such make-believe clergymen as Dowie can fall. It is from page 653 of the above journal, dated October 8th, 1880.:—

"D. T. [Observe it is to a correspondent], this has been reported [Mark the word 'reported'] to us:—On September 16th, 1874, [Notice the year], a young Englishman, by the name of Walker, who claimed to be a trance speaker, while attempting to simulate spirit-materialisations by the use of phosphorous, at a hotel in Toronto, Canada, severely burned himself. Another man, John Saunders, who went to his rescue, was so badly injured that he died on October 6th. At the inquest, the jury held Walker responsible for this man's death, but Walker had left the city immediately after the occurrence, and was out of the reach of justice. The whole affair was detailed in the newspapers at the time, and to them we must refer you. We have not a file of these papers beside us, and can only lay before you what has been reported to us."

This was read out in court against me, and until I had an opportunity to explain the facts connected with the paragraph and its origin, the affair looked very serious indeed. What are the facts then? I will give them here as I gave them in court, with the exception that I shall here detail them more fully.

First, then, let me take the accident itself. Its history is briefly this: In 1874, being 16 years of age, I was a farm labourer in Canada, working on the farm of John Bennet, of Markham, and afterwards of Michael Fisher, of Vaughan (whose son, my sister married), near Toronto. In October, the harvest season being over, I left the farm, and remained a week or two at Toronto before going to England. I was a Spiritualist at this time, and believed myself to be what, in Spiritualist phraseology, is termed a medium. In consequence of this I met with several Toronto Spiritualists, and attended several seances. On one of these occasions I met with Mr. Saunders, and I afterwards stayed at the same hotel with him in Front-street, Toronto. During the time we were together, we more than once speculated as to how the so-called physical phenomena of Spiritualism were produced. We both of us firmly believed in them, but from hearing so much talk about phosphorus being the source of spirit lights, or at all events a very close imitation of them, and being a lad at the time, I purchased a small portion of phosphorus *in the stick* for the purpose of seeing what effect it would have in this respect in the dark.

When the accident occurred I was thus experimenting in the bed-room occupied by Saunders and myself. I was totally ignorant of the chemical nature of the dangerous substance I had purchased. I took the stick out of the water, and holding it in my left hand, made some marks with it on a piece of paper. As may be supposed in a very short space of time indeed the phosphorus, by exposure to the atmosphere, ignited, and ran in the form of a burning liquid into my left hand. Mr. Saunders struck at the flame with his hand, and in this way burned himself.

Very early next morning I had to leave Toronto for Quebec *en route* for England, as I had purchased my ticket during the week, and had made all preparations for starting, in the shape of providing provisions and the other necessities for my trip on the day previous. This I had done *before* the accident occurred. These are facts for which proof can be provided independently altogether of my testimony. The local agency in Toronto for the "Allen" line of steamers, will be able to show from its books that I had purchased my ticket for England, per the *S.S. Peruvian*, before the unfortunate accident, and that consequently I was obliged to leave at the time I did, or otherwise I should have to forfeit my passage home, which at that time I could not afford to do. I am careful in the statement of these facts because the most malicious portion of the passage from the *Medium and Daybreak* is where it states "But Walker left the city immediately after the occurrence, and was out of the reach of justice," by which it is implied, if not expressly stated that I fled from justice. At that time there was no justice to flee from. From what I saw of Mr. Saunders after the accident, his burn did not appear to be dangerous at all, and I remember that I consoled myself at the time with the belief that I was by far the greater sufferer. It must be borne in mind that Mr. Saunders did not die until after I was in England, and then not from the severity of the burns, but from tetanus, which of course the severity of the burns may have occasioned. But, furthermore, it must not be forgotten that tetanus can be produced from a multiplicity of causes, and that in some systems a very slight flesh wound is sufficient to induce it.

When in England I learned of Mr. Saunders' death through a letter from my sister (Mrs. Fisher) I was

grieved exceedingly, and shortly afterwards T resolved to go back to Canada that I might learn the real facts of the case. This resolution was strengthened by an offer of employment from my brother-in-law on his farm. I therefore borrowed the passage money from my benevolent friend, Mr. E. Foster, chemist of Friargate, Preston, in Lancashire, and sailed for New York, from whence I departed for Toronto. T arrived in Toronto on a Sunday morning and walked to Vaughan, some 15 or 16 miles to the farm of my sister's father-in-law. It was here I read for the first time the verdict of the jury, which put a load upon my heart that seemed for the time to crush out every hope. The next morning I walked back to Toronto, on my way to my brother-in-law's farm some little distance out of Toronto near a small village called Ethel. Being out of money I sold a tin trunk with its contents, principally books, for a dollar and a half, and with one dollar of this I purchased a ticket as far as Harrisburg, resolving to walk the rest of the way, which was some considerable distance. It was nearly night when I arrived at Harrisburg, and I at once set off down the branch line in the direction of Ethel. I was very hungry, and after walking some distance I found a number of raspberry bushes growing wild. As the fruit was ripe I partook of it freely. Shortly afterwards I found a stream of clear water from which I took a copious draught. The result of this indiscretion was that I was attacked with so severe a fit of indigestion that I thought I should die. In this state I arrived just as darkness had covered the earth, at a very small village called Branchton. I stayed all night at the tavern, and paid my last fifty cents for bed and breakfast. In the morning I again started on my journey. When between Galt and Hespeler T was overtaken by a buggy, the driver of which, with the usual Canadian hospitality, requested me to get in and ride. We became speedily acquainted, and in the course of our conversation I told him where I was going, and my means of reaching my destination. He thereupon turned round his horse and drove me to the railway station, paid my ticket-fare to Ethel, and insisted upon my accepting sufficient for food for the journey. This benevolent gentleman was Dr. Cowen, of Guelph, Ontario, Canada. I arrived safely at Ethel the same night, and on the following morning commenced my work upon the farm. I worked here for three months. In the meantime I wrote a letter to the Chief of Police at Toronto, stating that I had read the verdict of the jury on the death of Mr. Saunders, and that if there was any case against me, I was perfectly willing to submit to a trial. I posted this letter with my own hands in the Ethel Post-office, so up to that point the destination of the letter is certain. Suffice it to say that, however it may be accounted for, I received no answer to my letter from that day to this. I have, therefore, naturally concluded ever since, that the Chief of the Police saw the absurdity of the verdict of the jury, and therefore declined to take any action in the matter.

I have carefully entered into the details of this somewhat unfortunate period of my life, all of which can be verified at any time at the expenditure of very little trouble, because I wish to show that all that my enemies were able to urge against me in the recent trial, was a maliciously written account of an accident that occurred in my boyhood. To this I may add that I was anxious to correct the erroneous judgment passed upon me in consequence of this report of the accident even by some of my friends.

It is quite simple to explain how the jury arrived at this verdict. It was only sufficient for them to know that I was a Spiritualist, that Mr. Saunders was also one, that I was experimenting with phosphorous and had left Toronto, for, they knew not where, and that Mr. Saunders had died from tetanus, evidently in consequence of my accident; and so having appearances against me, they very naturally supposed that I was afraid of remaining in Toronto, because I knew I was a guilty man. They therefore allowed their feelings to decide their judgments. They had no means of knowing my youth and my ignorance, so far as I am aware, and for anything they knew to the contrary I might be a hardened sinner. With so much room for the play of imagination and feeling, guided by their natural prejudices, it might be expected that any ordinary jury would be likely to be severe in its conclusions upon an occurrence of this kind. Nevertheless, even after considering these facts, I trust I may be pardoned for saying that the verdict they gave was a disgrace to them.

Even supposing that the facts were as stated, how would the case stand? Whilst simulating Spirit-Materialisations I burn myself. Another person comes to my assistance and burns himself. He dies from the effect. In what respect am I responsible for his death? I am responsible it is true for the accident, and only in this, so far as I was the involuntary occasion of it. Let me put a case to show my meaning. A man goes upon the river in a boat, the dangers connected with which he knows of Scarcely has he left the bank when the boat upsets, and he is in danger of being drowned. A noble-hearted man upon the bank observes him struggling, and not waiting for a moment leaps in to save him. Unfortunately the would-be saviour leaps in where the current is too strong, and is carried over the rapids, where he loses his life. The other man escapes to the bank and is saved. Is he therefore legally and morally responsible for the death of the person who would have saved him? Let justice speak from every heart, and all must say that, whilst regretting the accident, the painful burden of responsibility must be uplifted from the heart of the living. This, I say, even if the facts were as reported; but as I have shown such is far from being the case.

It may be asked how the paragraph got into the *Medium and Daybreak*, and finally into the hands of the Rev. J. A. Dowie? When I was in England last I had occasion to expose the conduct of James Burns, the editor

of the paper in question, in two letters which I dedicated to the Spiritualists of Great Britain. These letters were printed in pamphlet form and circulated all over England and Scotland at the expense of my friends who desired it. They were entitled "James Burns and his Spiritual Institution." To show the nature of these letters and the necessity for them, I shall perhaps be pardoned for making a quotation from them:—

"Lest it might be thought that this letter is alone the result of his treatment to me, it might be well to state a few things that I know about him. First then, as I have intimated, his Spiritual Institution, to which Spiritualists are so repeatedly and contemptuously entreated to subscribe is neither more nor less than his place of residence and business; his bookshop, cellar, sitting rooms and bed-rooms, at 15, Southampton Row, London. Is this honest? The Spiritualists of Britain are actually asked,—the poor hard-working men and women, believing in Spiritualism,—are urgently besought to send a portion of their earnings, gained by the sweat of their brow and perpetual toil, to pay the rent, taxes, and boarding expenses, not to mention the other incidental expenses, of his place of business, where he alone is benefitted. If the Institution belonged to the Spiritualists, and for their financial outlay in supporting it, they, some day or other, were to receive a dividend, one would understand his unparalleled 'cheek' displayed in his weekly bugging articles. But when he receives all the money he can for the purpose alone of making the Spiritualists pay for his family's board, clothing and house-rent, and when in reality the Spiritual Institution is his family's board, clothing and house-rent, the support, therefore, of which ought to be taken out of his business receipts, then one begins to suspect there is something rotten in the state of the Spiritual Institution or rather in the man who so christened it! If everything be as he represents it, and all the money he receives from subscriptions is spent for the benefit of Spiritualism, why dare he not publish a balance-sheet? Have not the Spiritualists a right to know how the money they give to him is spent? Does he ever show how a half-penny of the money he receives from year to year goes? Where is the printing press that was to belong to the Spiritualists on his receipt of £500 to purchase it with, some little time ago now, and which was to print his paper on his own premises? We ask again, where is the printing press, and the evidence that the Spiritualists of Britain own it or ever have owned it? Thirty pounds of this money he received from one town alone—Preston, in Lancashire. Is the Medium now printed at the so-called Spiritual Institution? He may, and no doubt will say something about this, but will he answer the questions I have asked?"

Again, does he acknowledge the receipt of all the money his subscribers send him? Will he tell us in what way he acknowledged the receipt of £50 from Mr. Layley, of Victoria, Australia? Did he do it otherwise than by sending a cabinet portrait of himself, with yours truly, J. Burns, written upon it? Did he ever inform the English Spiritualists of the receipt of that sum? Is it not a fact that he received money from Dunedin, N.Z., for books, and that he neither returned money nor books? And have there not been similar cases to this from Australia? Have there not been similar cases in England? In Washington for instance? Has he returned them either the money, or the books they ordered, though they have written to him several times about the matter? Dare he tell how he stands with the Banner of Light Publishing Company, Boston, U.S.? Is it not true that they will not supply him with any more of their goods on credit, though they once did."

To these questions he never furnished answers, but when two of his best friends, Judge Peterson and William Oxley, of Manchester, who were both liberal in their monetary subscriptions and literary contributions to his paper, asked him for an explanation, he so insulted them that they straightway withdrew their support.

As may be naturally supposed, having occasion and feeling it necessary in the interests of justice, to expose him, he afterwards took every occasion to injure me. He attempted to do it when I left for Africa by a ridiculously peurile attack upon me, in the course of which he manufactured a phrenological delineation of my head for the benefit of the "Zulus" to whom he said "Little Tommy" was going. But he thought his hour of triumph had come when two gentlemen by name, Messrs. Smart and Spriggs had concluded at the invitation of the Victorian Association of Spiritualists to visit Melbourne. Mr. Spriggs, as is well known, is the medium of the Russell-street seances, and Mr. Smart is apparently his protector. When these two gentlemen started, Mr. Burns of the Institution, knowing that his columns were closed to me for reply, and that I was away in Africa, published an *Australian number* of his paper, and sent a quantity of extra copies out here in their charge. This *Australian number* of the *Medium* was the introduction of these two worthies to the colony, and it was this number that contained the maliciously false paragraph intended to injure me. Mr. Burns knew that I had many friends here, and this was his attempt to turn them into enemies.

As to how it got into Mr. Dowie's hands I can only surmise. It is sufficient, however, that I know whence, when, and why it came to these colonies. Burns sent it here, and over the world for the express purpose of injuring me. My scepticism as to the genuineness of the phenomena at Russell-street,—may be sufficient to account for the rest, especially when it is remembered with what bitterness Mr. A. J. Smart tries to repay me for throwing doubt upon his circle.

I have now traced the history and object of the paragraph with which Mr. Dowie sought to ruin me in the Court during my trial.

After finding that this stab did not take effect, Mr. Dowie was completely discomfited. The Judge evidently leaned—if taking a just view of the case can be called "leaning,"—to our side and this was observed by the clerical litigant with great concern throughout. It was at this stage that he had offered to withdraw the case, after as he thought, and his counsel admitted thrown, this mud at me. "It is simply a question of throwing mud your Honor," said Mr. Hood, and having thrown it, he begged to withdraw. The ever in my life my feelings were tried it was then. Everything possible had been done to injure me, and here was the man who had done it, crying for mercy. We had in the court, and Mr. Dowie knew it at the time, a clergyman who informed a member of my defence committee that he felt as though the Lord had sent him there to expose the wickedness of my reverend opponent. On the brief of my counsel were several references to facts, which would have thrown a light on Mr. Dowie's character very unwelcome to him. Was I to forbear ruining the man, when he had done all in his power to ruin me? "Yes," said my friends, whom I consulted, "Yes," suggested my legal advisers, and "Yes," I answered. The Infidel hand uplifted in self defence dropped calmly at the cry for mercy, and the Christian calumniator was spared exposure.

That we are taking no unfair view of the facts, we quote the report of the trial from the *Carlton Advertiser* to show:—

The Libel Action.

"The celebrated case of the Rev. J. A. Dowie v. Thomas Walker, in which the former sued for £250 damages, for alleged libel, came on for hearing at the Court on Thursday, and contrary to expectations ended in a fiasco, as the Rev. J. A. Dowie throw up the sponge. The facts of the case are as follows:—The rev. gentleman, aforesaid, came over from Sydney some six months ago, and involved himself in a religious controversy with Mr. Thomas Walker, the well-known free-thought lecturer. The controversy was carried on by correspondence which the clerical gentleman decided on publishing with a preface of his own, but without Mr. Walker's final reply. Mr. Walker having learned the intentions of his clerical friend, cautioned him against the impropriety of such a course, and threatened to denounce the pamphlet on its publication. Mr. Dowie took no notice of the protest, and the work appeared in due course, whereupon advertisements were inserted in the Age and Daily Telegraph signed by Mr. Walker denouncing the pamphlet as misleading, malicious, and untruthful. The Rev. Mr. Dowie then requested a public apology from Mr. Walker, couched in the most abject terms, to be inserted in the daily papers, or in the event of a refusal he would set the law in motion, and institute a criminal action which would in case of conviction, entail both fine and imprisonment. Mr. Walker positively refused to apologise, when the rev. gentleman placed the matter in the hands of his solicitors, who at once commenced legal proceedings. Not for fine and imprisonment, however, but substantial damages, amounting to £250. The case came on for hearing before Judge Cope and a jury of four, on Monday last, but the absence of witnesses to prove the publication of the so-called libel caused a postponement of the ease until Thursday. Several witnesses were examined with a view of proving the authorship of the libel but Mr. Purves, who conducted the defence, offered to admit the publication, if the Rev. Mr. Dowie were put into the witness-box. Mr. Hood who appeared for the plaintiff, did not appear to relish the idea of his client being submitted to an overhaul by Mr. Purves, and the rev. gentleman was not called upon. Mr. Walker was examined, but nothing material was elicited from him. After lunch, whilst the case was proceeding, Mr. Dowie spoke to his counsel and the result was that an offer was made to Mr. Purves to withdraw the case, each side to pay their own costs. After some consultation, Mr. Walker agreed to the proposal on condition that he should be allowed to make a public statement in court, in order to explain some circumstances, which were insinuated by Mr. Hood in cross-examination. After some hesitation on the part of Mr. Dowie, it was agreed that the privilege should be accorded, and the case was withdrawn.

The result cannot be looked upon as a great victory by the Rev. Mr. Dowie and his friends, for instead of his lacerated feelings being healed by a verdict of £250 and costs, he has to part with cash to the amount of £60 or £70 to pay his counsel's expenses. A few such victories would be a very doubtful benefit to the rev. gentleman, who is reported to have a hankering for similar actions.

Not content, however, that we have shown him mercy, that his case fell through, and that by withdrawing it he virtually admitted the truth of the advertisement which occasioned his action, on the following Sunday he relapsed back into his old malignity, forgot his recent defeat and exposure, and gave a sermon which is thus reported in the *Age*:—

Sensational Preaching at Collingwood.

The Rev. J. A. Dowie preached on Sunday evening at the Tabernacle, in Sackville-street. Collingwood (a large wooden building seating 1500 people). The building is well lighted, there is a small and effective organ and a good choir. The seats are all free. The Tabernacle is situated in the midst of a dense mass of working class residents in the neighbourhood. The Gospel is here preached on Sundays, and occasional religious

meetings are held during each week. It must be apparent that if well conducted, such a place will do much good to the people for whose benefit it is specially built. The place was, as usual, crowded on Sunday evening. The Rev. J. A. Dowie, who has recently figured in a law court in Melbourne, officiated. He is well known in Sydney and Adelaide, not only in leading Salvation Armies, but in haranguing crowds on various subjects, and also in contributing controversial letters on many topics in various "religious" journals. On Sunday evening his advertised subject was *The Modern Prophets of Baal*, but in reality his subject was *Spiritualism and its Modern Defenders*. Mr. Dowie stated that he had been in the Ministry fourteen years in all, and alleged that God had taken him from business and made him a minister; also, that he had personally made enormous sacrifices in giving up business and becoming a preacher. He had once, with six other persons, been in a minority of seven on a great public question in Sydney. By perseverance, his minority carried the day by compelling the Sydney Government to save the lives of the two young lads whose case had caused so much sensation in Sydney. He proceeded to say that *Spiritualism* was an immoral religion, and that it supported prostitution. Who were the main supporters of *Spiritualism*? Tom Walker and Dr. Moorhouse. A wild and incoherent narrative followed, descriptive of a publican's reception of penniless and of rich customers at a public house bar, Mr. Dowie designating publicans indiscriminately as *Jezebels*. Mr. Dowie accompanied this description with extravagant and ludicrous dramatic actions which caused quite a simmer of merriment] and slightly suppressed laughter. Thereupon Mr. Dowie said, "Oh, you may laugh. You can laugh yourself into hell; but I reckon you cannot laugh yourself out of hell." "Walker," continued Mr. Dowie, "calls himself an Atheist, Deist, Materialist and Rationalist; but I will tell you what he is—he is the child of the devil." The latter word is a favorite with Mr. Dowie. So is the word hell, which figured at least fifty times throughout the preacher's "discourse." Referring to the recent trial of *Dowie v. Walker*, Mr. Dowie said, "I have sometimes at the midnight hour reeled with the intellectual fumes proceeding from that miasma of hell—*Spiritualism*;" his meaning being that he had become stupefied by reading so much *Spiritualistic* literature. *Spiritualism* had many defenders. Walker was one of them. A man in Canada once died from the effects of one of Walker's *spiritualistic* experiments. Mr. Dowie prophesied that "Walker's career would end in darkness, perhaps in blood." Referring to the recent trial, Mr. Dowie, who at this point became intensely excited, said: "If the judge who tried the late case is an atheist, then he is a defender of *Spiritualism*; if the barrister who defended it is a legal larrikin, then he is a defender of *Spiritualism*; and if the solicitor in it is a disgrace to politics, then he is a defender of *Spiritualism*." Mr. Dowie then spoke fiercely concerning Mr. Purves, the barrister, by name. He accused him of lying at the trial and defended himself (Dowie) against the alleged repeated charges of falsehood brought against him in the course of Mr. Purves's remarks in the County Court. He (Dowie) had, through his counsel, at the outset offered to go into the witness-box, and throughout the trial was most anxious to do so. He would ultimately have gone into the witness-box at the close of Walker's evidence, but the case was, in effect, stopped by the judge saying there was no case to go to the jury. Mr. Dowie concluded by excitedly saying that he knew that there were *re*; porters present, and occasionally said, "Put that down Mr. *Spiritualist*," "Put that down, press." Taken as a whole, the proceedings, which lasted two hours, were simply disgraceful, and calculated to bring religion into contempt. Although prayer was offered and hymns sung, yet the extravagant and burlesque actions and violent gestures of Mr. Dowie not only in his "sermon," but even in his prayers, to say nothing of the coarse and abusive language used by him in reference to absent gentlemen of respectability and good social standing, were alike calculated to hurt the cause of religion. Large numbers of persons continued to leave the Tabernacle from the moment Mr. Dowie became excitable and abusive until the end of the service.

I would ask before closing this introduction, a little of the reader's attention, whilst I say a few words about the pamphlet itself. When it was resolved to print it as an appendix to the pamphlet published by Mr. Dowie, and as a reply to his last letter, the idea naturally suggested itself to procure for it the same printer and publisher who gave the Rev. J. A. Dowie's concoctions to the public. The chief reason for this was that the antidote would thereby be more likely to follow in the track of the poison, and so, circulating through the same channel, correct the harm that it might have done. In company with a friend therefore I called at the business house of George Robertson and Co., and obtained the manager's consent to placing the name of the firm upon the corner of my pamphlet. The same day I called at the office of Walker, May and Co., and obtained their services as the printers. If I remember aright, the following day, or at all events very shortly afterwards, I sent them the first instalment of M.S. and £15 on account for the work. Before the work had proceeded very far, however, I received a note from the manager of George Robertson and Co., stating that they declined to have their name appear according to promise. Walker, May and Co. still went on with the printing until the entire work was completed and the first part of this introduction was in type; to my astonishment then, they refused to go any further on the grounds that some of the contents of my letter were blasphemous. All my attempts to demonstrate that they were not responsible for my conclusions or opinions, and that our relationship to each other was purely one of business, and finally that it was unfair to print Mr. Dowie's letter and not my answer, but more than all to take the work, to complete it and give me all the trouble of correcting proofs, not to speak of my loss

of time, and then to refuse to issue—I say all attempts to demonstrate this were in vain. They took legal advice—learned that in the eyes of the law I had blasphemed in telling the truth—and they therefore positively refused to prosecute the work any further. It is only fair to state, of them, however, that when an offer was made to purchase the stereotype plates they were not above asking £18 for them, and finally taking £14

I afterwards went to another printer, taking him the marked copy which Walker, May and Co. had submitted for legal criticism, and with the same result. He refused to print it on the grounds that he would not endanger his business by giving his imprint to what had been shown to be blasphemy in the eyes of the law.

Some of my friends advised me to soften some of the passages and to omit others, as otherwise I should not be able to procure a printer for the work in Melbourne. I knew not how to answer these except by informing them that I was fully determined to have the letter printed as it had been written if I had to purchase a printer's shop for the purpose. I even went so far as to enquire at what cost I could hire or purchase a sufficient quantity of the requisite materials, so as to ascertain the possibility of employing this resource after all others had failed. Whilst in this dilemma, upon recommendation we tried the firm of White law and Son, and this time with success. Being liberal-minded they readily undertook the work, and it is from their press that this is given to the world.

The most blasphemous portions of the pamphlet—the portions I was advised to soften or withdraw, which were chiefly objected to by the printers and lawyers, and which were quoted against me during my trial—are those paragraphs arranged under their respective headings from page 37 to page 49. And what are they? Simply proofs taken from the Bible itself, that the Bible is not a fit and proper book to teach us ethics! I have not manufactured the passages; I have not misquoted them. I have simply taken the passages as they stand in the book for the purpose of making clearly manifest that the writers of the Bible, were little above a state of barbarism, when moved by their impulsive genius to transmit their thoughts and feelings to posterity. If the Book was admitted to be nothing more than a product of the genius, intellect, feelings and experience of a people struggling through slavery and misfortune towards a higher perfection, weighted with superstition, led by delusive hopes, and animated from time to time by the doleful songs of the Hebrew poets, which ever and anon throw light and shade on the Jewish character, I should scorn, dear reader, I assure you to draw your special attention to these evidences of great imperfection. "To err is human," I should say with you, and we should both agree that it would be folly to look for perfection in a people ignorant, superstitious, and poor. We might as well expect to learn the highest truths of morality or science from the barbarous hordes of the deserts of to-day, as expect to learn such, from those who wandered in the deserts of Sinai, or wailed their lamentations on the banks of the rivers that flowed 'neath the shades of the willows of Babylon. But when the Bible is put forth as the infallible "Word of God," the case is different. We stand face to face with what ought to be the very paragon of perfection. In its pages, the trembling maiden, with modesty beaming like a sacred halo over her presence, ought to find a crystal stream so pure, that as she kneels to drink from its perennial flow she may see her image reflected there even more sublimely pure than the spotless original. When the mother has entered the silent portals of its many temples, her ears should hear no sound withering up her womanhood, blighting her maternal instincts, and robbing her of the divine flowers of a mother's love. The eager-minded boy, as he intently follows the steps of his favourite heroes by the light of the evening torch, should have no cause to dwell on bloody battle fields, and scenes of woful carnage. The Bible, as the Word of God, should fire his imagination with deeds of the noblest virtue, with undying acts of benevolence, justice and love, and with words of unmistakeable wisdom, purity and truth.

In short, the Bible, if it be "God's Word," should be our final appeal, and master on all matters—government, law, truth and conduct—connected with life. As to law and government, Christians themselves have outgrown it, and there is not a civilized government in the world which would think for a moment of shaping its laws according to the standard either of the Old or New Testament. Legislative measures are now passed, not because they are shewn to be in harmony with the sacred books, not because they are in accordance with the teaching of Moses and Jesus, but because they are deemed necessary for the welfare of the people. It is not, therefore, to be wondered at that the laws of the time of Moses have been discarded, and that our modern law-makers have dared to improve on the laws which they believe to have been given by the wisdom of God Himself.

In matters affecting the truths of science and history, also, the Christians have given up the Bible as an authority. Dr. Colenso and Professor Robertson Smith, not to mention Renouf, and a long list of others, have thrown wide open the gates to the army of criticism, and now on the Fort deserted by Deity, there floats the Infidel flag.

In this letter, in answer to Mr. Dowie, and for the information of Christian readers, I have done my little share in demonstrating that the Bible is not less defective from a moral point of view. It is not a tit book to be put in the hands of the young, and I trust I may be excused for saying, I have proved that fact in my pamphlet.

"But," said an objector to me, "You have only stirred up dirt, which it were better to leave at rest." "And," I

asked in reply, "who is the benefactor of the village repeatedly a prey to disease and death, he who stirs up the water with its dirt and poison, in order that he may keep the villagers from drinking it without filtering, or he who leaves the dirt and poison to quietly do its work of destruction and woe?"

"But you should remember what tender recollections, what dear associations cluster round the book, and how through ages its history and teachings have woven themselves into the thoughts and lives of the children of men."

"Les préjugés, ami, sont les rois du vulgaire," replied I in the words of Voltaire. "But surely truth is higher than prejudice, and facts are of more value than bad habits. It is time, now, when we have Truth within our reach, to habit her, as we have done our errors, in the sacred drapery of loving memory and to view her in the gentle light of hallowed association and endearment."

What I have done in my pamphlet is only a very small fraction indeed of what needs doing. I deem it important that I should inform my readers that I have not said one tithe of what ought to be said on the Bible's imperfection, viewed as the "Word of God." I feel that the sooner we realise the true position the Bible occupies, the sooner we shall be able to appreciate the many excellent literary passages, as well as excellencies in other respects of which the book is by no means devoid. What I have said, I have said aiming at that end, for that the good may be rightly valued it is essentially necessary that we do not over estimate the bad.

As the subject of Spiritualism is frequently introduced throughout the letter, perhaps it would be as well to clearly inform the readers what my exact position upon this subject is. I will do so briefly. At the age of 13 I accepted Spiritualism as others accept Christianity. I believed myself to be a medium, accounting for my natural precocity, good memory and fluency of speech, especially when laboring under excitement, anagalous, I take it to that experienced at religious revivals and at quaker meetings by the supposition that I was influenced by Spiritual beings. In this I am now free to confess that I was as much deluded as anyone who encouraged and accepted my faith. My faith and that of others was intensified by the wonderful phenomena occurring in the presence of other so-called mediums, and by the reading of such works as the Dialectic Society's reports, Professor Crooke on physical phenomena, Alfred Russell Wallace, on Miracles and the life of D. D. Home. I was also charmed at the time, and "strengthened in the faith," by the orations of Mrs. Tappan and the writings of A. J. Davis. The publications of Prof. Denton, Robert Dale Owen, Dr. Peebles, and perhaps more than all, Hudson Tuttle, increased my respect for the intellectual position of its leaders, and influenced by my feelings from within, and these causes and others from without, I publicly advocated the subject for some considerable period of my short life. During that period I cannot over-estimate either the kindnesses I have received from believers in it; or the stimulus it gave to my intellectual faculties. But what it started and did so much to quicken, now takes me out of its fold. Closer examination of facts shows me, at least, that there is a fatal gap between the phenomena and their reputed cause. Unless we are justified in postulating a spirit, in the same manner as our ancestors did their gods, wherever our ignorance steps in, we have no evidence that positively brings home to "the spirits" any of the facts alleged as spiritualistic. This I feel myself qualified to say, since I have studied the subject quite as much—if not more, than any other I have yet entered upon.

I must correct a misunderstanding that may arise from what I have just said. I do not wish it to be understood that all the phenomena described as Spiritualistic are fraudulent, or the result of any deception or trickery whatsoever. I am as much convinced as that I am writing, because I have observed them with what critical powers I possess, that there are facts impossible to be accounted for on these grounds. There are facts to the origin of which, in our present state of knowledge, so far as I am aware, no explanation can be offered, and that deserve explanation as much as the fall of the apple did to the enquiring mind of Newton. What I simply wish to insist upon is that the wonderfulness of a fact is no proof that a spirit produced it

If I were to venture upon a definition of Spiritualism with my present experience, it would be something like the following.—A system where the true and false, the good and harmful, the wise and foolish, the honest and the designing are Strangely mingled. It is for the most part a conscientious desire to render Supernaturalism more reasonable and evident, and to give coherency, personalities and reality to the realm of the Invisible and Unknown. Its roots lie deep down in human credulity and weakness. Out of hopes generated in the school of Faith the Spiritualist builds his invisible temple.

Men being born imperfect in a world of ignorance, have a natural tendency towards some species of superstition, which they can only correct by exchanging it for positive knowledge. Given a natural bias towards believing anything, and the proof required to convince us of it will decrease in proportion as that bias is strong. "The wish is father to the thought," was a statement full of wisdom, and it would not be far from the truth if we thus altered it—"The wish is often father to the facts."

It is impossible to express the pain I feel whilst I am writing this, for I know it will wound many of those who have been the very best friends I have had in this life. Some of those who have offered me counsel and help in the hour of need, and whom I respect and love as noble-minded kind-hearted men and women—my generous benefactors—will doubtless blame me for the step I have taken. But T cannot help it. I feel it my

highest duty to be true to myself and to them, and for that reason I refuse to act the hypocrite. At some future time I intend entering upon this subject in a work devoted to the purpose, and therein answering the question as far as I can, why good intentioned people should deceive and be deceived in matters of this kind?

This being my present position upon the subject, it may be asked why I have, so far as I have, defended it in my letters to Mr. Dowie? Because I believe in justice. Spiritualism is far ahead of his Orthodoxy, and I determined to defend it from his despicable attacks. I wished to show the world, as I state on the concluding page that "Whether the phenomena of Spiritualism are; to be explained by an appeal to another world or to this, and this alone" Mr. Dowie "had libelled its supporters, perverted its philosophy and misrepresented its literature." If this be borne in mind as the pamphlet is read, my object will be less likely to be misunderstood.

As to the Orthodoxy of the Rev. John Alexander Dowie, it must be despicable even to the Christians themselves. As this is made sufficiently evident during the course of the pamphlet I will waste no words to prove it here. I would only like to conclude by asking him in the language of Zopire, from the tragedy of Mahomet.

Tu veux.

Commander aux humains de penser comme toi:

Tu ravages le monde, et tu prétends l'instruire.

Ah! si par erreurs il s'est laissé séduire,

Si la nuit de mensonge a pour nous égarer,

Par quels flambeaux appeux veux-tu nous éclairer?

To which he may perhaps offer us the answer of Mahomet:—

. . . *Je connais ton peuple, il a besoin d'orrcur;*
Ou véritable on faux, mon culte est nécessaire.

However, that may be we will leave him to dance his jigs and prate his folly at the Tabernacle as leader of the Salvation Army, His atmosphere is too foul for us to remain in it, and we now depart from it with a sense of relief.

I remain, dear reader, yours truly,
THOS. WALKER.

June 28th, 1882.

Orthodoxy Unmasked.

PRESTON' COTTAGE, Lennox-street (North), Richmond,

28th March, 1882.

REV. J. A. DOWIE.
REV. SIR,—

You commence your letter dated 18th March with a saying of the ancient Greeks—" Against stupidity even the gods are powerless,"—and, judging by the contents of your letter, I am inclined to believe the Greeks were not far wrong. Thomas Paine has immortalized a saying which your letter abundantly justifies:—" To argue with a man," said he, "who has renounced his reason is like giving medicine to the dead." It is out of no ill-feeling towards you personally that I say this, but because your letter conclusively proves either that you have not the capacity to reason accurately, or you have temporarily renounced that capacity. From the beginning to the end of your letter there is nothing else but misrepresentation of facts, imputation to me of views and opinions I have not avowed, wholesale libels upon the Spiritualists and Free-thinkers, and abuse, and insult, and personal spleen of the rankest order. I am not going (as you have done) to accuse you of these serious controversial defects, without even an attempt at substantiation; but in this letter I intend to prove that my charges against you are supported by the facts, and are such as you have forced upon yourself by your

disingenuous conduct. This I intend shall be the difference between my letter and yours, that whereas we both bring charges against each other, you have failed (as I shall show) to support them with the necessary evidence; whereas I shall give undeniable proof (I mean, to all fair-minded men) that what I say of you is fully borne out by the evidence I shall adduce.

It is, therefore, the utmost folly on your part to shelter yourself from the force of what I have already said, and what I yet intend to say, behind a convenient theory of your own, to the effect that because, forsooth, I do not hold your creed, I must be under the influence of the devil (whose existence you cannot prove, and therefore only capable of abusing you. Such a method of argument puts an end at once to all fair play and crushes all logic beneath the iron heel of vituperation To put me in the same list with the writer of the verse you have quoted as from the spirits, and along with those who have threatened your life, simply because I retorted your abuse upon yourself, and proved that you had really done all of which you had accused me, in reference to dishonesty of discussion, is not only to neglect the rules of common courtesy, but to deliberately vilify by deliberate misrepresentation one against whom you can prove no charge, but that of being, at least, your equal.

Let us, for just one moment, consider this method of venomously stabbing an adversary, which you have apparently employed with all the skill and experience of a trained adept. Certain "spirits" have honoured you with a composition which is anything but flattering. The "scribe" of the said "spirit" was an inured gaol-bird; the composition was accompanied by abusive epithets, which, if I may be pardoned for saying so, look more like your own concoctions than anything else; and the inference from all this is, that only such things can be expected from Spiritualists! Such is the legitimate outcome, you more than insinuate, of the teachings of Spiritualism. Now, Rev. Sir, what would you say if I were to go to the Melbourne gaol and to insist that all the *Christians* there were there in direct consequence of Christian teaching, and that lowness of mind and conduct was all that could be expected from the believers of your faith? The good, the wise, the pure, the virtuous I would not think about—no, only the liars, the thieves, the murderers were the *true* Christians. What would you say then? Why! that I had grossly slandered and misrepresented you. Now, sir, is it not evident even to you that this is precisely the course you have taken? You instance conduct for which I am in nowise responsible, which I would unhesitatingly condemn, and which is no more the result of Spiritualism or Free-thought than are your misrepresentations of my arguments or your personal abuse of me, and you insist upon placing me upon that level. I ask you candidly, is it fair? Is it honourable? Would such reasoning be just if applied to yourself? I will ask you further are you prepared to defend the conduct of every murderer, thief, and criminal of every stamp, if he calls himself a *Christian*? Am I right if I class you and Ned Kelly together, because the notorious bushranger called himself a Christian? If not, why have you not the common honesty to perceive that you have acted with great injustice in ranking me with all that is filthy and objectionable in the Spiritualistic ranks?

You must pardon me for being a little sceptical as to what you say touching the correspondence you had with the "spirits" in Sydney—or, rather, the letters you received from them. One of your sentences on this point commences "Another of your friends wrote to me," by which you affirm that the "scribe" out of Darlinghurst, and the writer of another letter to you, were my friends. I am very sceptical on this point, for I know of no friend of mine in Sydney who has been in gaol for the crimes you indicate, or indeed for any crimes at all. Will you please, therefore, to mention their names, or otherwise to withdraw the foul accusation that they were my "friends?" Please also to mention the name of the "circle," and a few of the names of the "elevated" Spiritualists who are alluded to in the letter you have received and quoted. I am anxious for you to do this because I feel morally convinced that the whole affair is an imposition—I will not say of yours, but of someone's intending to cast contempt upon the doctrines you have undertaken to destroy. I therefore await your proofs for the various allegations you have made, and which, if proven, I should denounce as strongly as you.

Now, what warrant have you for saying—"Yes, your name is Legion, for you are many, and your devices are many. You are all things to all men, if by any means you can destroy some with your master's many wiles, ancient and modern?" Am I a Christian? Evidently not, according to your showing. Then, how can I be *all* things to all men? The fact of the matter is, I have not really avowed myself to be anything but an infidel and rationalist in these letters, and these colours I have never changed for a single moment, "What is more, I do not intend to change them, at least until better evidence than you have brought forward can be advanced to dislodge me from my position. 'Tis not I, but your own Paul, upon his own admission, who was "all things to all men," an unblushing hypocrite of the worst dye, and a dissimulator by profession. And I say this, too, without any desire to detract from any good he may have done, but simply to state a fact which is supported by New Testament evidence.

You say, that the statement you made that your beliefs were not in question "is the exact truth;" and you continue—"The question upon which alone you were called in by Mr. Strachan to help him concerning was 'Spiritualism,' for that was the only question discussed between him and I [*I sic*]. That question you have cunningly and persistently evaded. Your calling of my beliefs in question does not matter a jot. I met a drunken man who called them in question the other day, and whilst he was doing so he stammered, staggered, and fell

into the gutter."

Now, in answer to this perversion of truth, let me refer you to Mr. Strachan's letter. In that letter did I accept any challenge of yours, or was it not I who challenged you? It was I who challenged you, which challenge you could accept or reject as you felt disposed. The question which Mr. Strachan asked you was, "Would you have any objection to enter into a public discussion on *the following* [italics mine]:—you to affirm 'That Orthodoxy is conducive to morality and progress,' and Mr. Thos. Walker . . . to affirm 'That Infidelity is conducive to morality and progress.'" The challenge, therefore, was to you, and if you did not feel like accepting it, the simple course was open to you of declining it. But because this challenge to you was connected with, or arose out of, a conversation you had with Mr. Strachan, I am abused because I will not defend, in the manner you wish, what you attacked in his presence. Although in all probability I should not have challenged you had you not seen Mr. Strachan, nor Mr. Strachan seen me, yet the propositions which I worded for Mr. Strachan's letter, and for which alone I am responsible, were my generalization of the real issue there is between us, and my statement of the platform on which I was ready at any time to meet you. In my challenge I made no reference to Spiritualism whatever, and I think it was clear and distinct enough to enable you to understand precisely what it was that I wanted you to discuss with me. That challenge, which commenced this correspondence, called your beliefs in question; it asked you if you were ready to support them by evidence, and, in public discussion, to show the good you believe them to have done. But avoiding all this, the plainest of evidence, you insist that I shall be bound, not to my challenge, but to a conversation which you had with Mr. Strachan when I was absent! Could anything be more unfair? I am to stand by and defend, I say again, not what I have admitted my willingness to stand by and defend, but the opinions of Mr. Strachan, or your idea of those opinions, expressed to you in the course of a conversation upon the subject of Spiritualism; and that too, as I say, when I was absent, and did not even know of your presence in Melbourne!

But, furthermore, you have made an inaccuracy in asserting that I was "called in by Mr. Strachan to help him." Mr. Strachan did not call upon me to do anything of the kind. The facts are as I stated them in my letter of February the 8th:—"I believe I am responsible for the challenge to you Mr. Strachan and I were talking over various matters based upon a conversation he had had with you, and whilst doing so *I asked him if you were willing to defend yourself in public*. As he did not know, I requested him to ask you the question." [Italics mine.] Therefore you will see, and you ought to have seen when you received the letter from which I have just quoted, that the challenge to you, and my letter to you, were not in response to any request of Mr. Strachan for help, but for the simple purpose of asking you if you were willing to defend *your* cause in public. There the matter might have dropped if you had answered yes or no; but as it is, even with the statement of these facts in your possession you persistently make it appear that I have broken faith with Mr. Strachan, deserted my cause, and betrayed the confidence of my supporters. Once for all let me again inform you—

- That the challenge arose with me, and was simply my own suggestion.
- That Mr. Strachan was simply one of the determining causes of it, and the instrument of its conveyance to you, but by no means the dictator or requester of it.
- That its deliberate intention was to call your beliefs in question, and to ask you if you were ready to defend them.
- That I have evaded nothing which my challenge contained. I took it for granted that he who makes, or fain would make, such sad havoc of the faiths of others would not be loth to defend his own; but it seems in this I was mistaken.

Your case of the drunken man with whom you say you would not discuss questions of religion and morality is beneath you as a clergyman, and I am half inclined to think that you invented it for the occasion. Granted that I am as drunk and incapable of understanding sound arguments on religion and morality as the man who fell into the gutter, is it likely to cause me to appreciate the comforts of sobriety to hear you abusing, falsifying, and slandering me? To compare a man to a drunkard in the gutter, because, having examined your faith he is bound by the laws of evidence to reject it as wanting in fact and proof, is indeed the trick of the cuttle fish with a vengeance. It is too late in the day to beg the question in this manner*, and you should leave the public to judge whether I am sufficiently sober, mentally and morally, to understand your arguments.

I have already partially replied to the following statement and accusation:—"Spiritualism," you say, "and that alone, is the question which originated this correspondence; but for reasons of your own, which you dare not avow, you shun it."

I have shown that "my challenge" "and that alone originated this correspondence," so it only remains for me further to point out the libel of the concluding sentence—I shun Spiritualism for reasons of my own which I dare not avow? Nothing could be more false than this statement, for not only did I in my last letter to you say, "If you will undertake a defence of your Orthodoxy, I will undertake a defence of Spiritualism *pur et simple*, since you appear to be so much afraid to meet Infidelity in any other form"; but I positively stated my reasons for preferring a discussion upon Infidelity rather than upon Spiritualism. "Spiritualism," said I, "in its present

form is of modern origin; it therefore will not so effectually serve me as will the term Infidelity, in proving that our progress is *not* due to the influence of Christianity."

I have only so far shunned Spiritualism as to wish to stick to the terms of the challenge, though I have followed and corrected you in your tirade against the Spiritualists throughout. But now I am free to say more, as showing you that there is no reason for my conduct which I dare not avow. There are many things passing under the name of Spiritualism which I cannot defend, arising solely out of the ignorance and imperfection of humanity, just as there are follies committed by Christians to which you could not give your sanction. I believe, at present, that a diffusion of the sceptical spirit, and a cultivation of the habits of freedom of thought, are calculated to do far more good than a diffusion of the belief in Spiritualism among men. So this is the task I have now set myself:—To make, as far as I am able, my fellow-men be critical; to cause them to weigh the evidence of all facts claiming a super-mundane origin very carefully; and to reject even Spiritualism itself if the facts do not warrant its acceptance. There is much of Spiritualism that is simply superstition—less hurtful and despicable than that which you profess, it is true, but, nevertheless, superstition. This I am just as much anxious to destroy as I am that of yours, as I am anxious to have all superstition destroyed, even to that which lingers yet on the horizon of my own mentality. Superstition is the construction of ignorance; our lack of capacity to properly understand the nature of cause and effect, and their relation to each other. Men are superstitious, therefore, to the extent that they do not understand a phenomenon, its relation to its cause, and the nature of the cause itself. You, for instance, are superstitious when you attribute what I do to the action of the Devil; for, in doing so, you have a *false* idea of causation which determines my conduct, which causation is none other than my organization, its natural antecedents, and my surroundings. It is positive knowledge, verified by repeated tests, and submitted to the most searching examinations of criticism, which is calculated to remove all defects of this description; and it is this kind of knowledge, which has always been preceded by the sceptical spirit, and which has always been condemned as heresy by the Church in all its divisions, that I was anxious to defend in a public debate. As I said in my last letter to you, "The fact of the matter is, the freedom of thought permitted and encouraged by both Deists and Atheists has liberated humanity from the slavery of Faith, and opened to them the thousand doors of Truth." Again, "I was prepared to show the good that all forms of Infidelity have done, and are still calculated to do; for, encouraging (as they do) the freedom of thought, they enwide the horizon of human knowledge, and open a myriad avenues to aspiration, discovery, and progression." Such, then, are my reasons more fully stated for preferring the term Infidelity, and which reasons, though stated briefly in my last letter, you so shamelessly asserted that I dare not avow.

As to whether you dare to defend your views in public discussion or not, I leave to the judgment of whoever may chance to read this correspondence.

I now come to that portion of your letter which reviews my charge of numerous misrepresentations. The first is about the arguing upon two distinct platforms *at the same time*. I asked you *to* quote to me from my letters where I had requested such an absurdity, and your reply now is that two letters mentioned "can leave no other impression upon candid minds than that you wanted *one discussion*, in which the issues would be confused, and not *two distinct discussions*; you never use the plural number, as would be required if Christianity and Infidelity were to be separately discussed upon their respective merits." And notwithstanding my explanation in my last letter, you add "that is my impression still." "Indeed," you say, "your closing question in that letter proves it; for you therein say—'Are you willing to discuss the relative merits of Orthodoxy *and* Infidelity?' You nowhere speak of two distinct discussions." It appears to me that you do not know the meaning of the word "discussion," which Ogilvie gives as "debate, disquisition, the agitation of a point or subject with a view to elicit truth, the treatment of a subject by argument." Now, it is not necessary to have two discussions to examine the relative merits of two things. You may discuss whether the rose or the violet is the more fragrant, without *two* discussions, may you not? And in the same manner you may discuss the relative merits of Orthodoxy and Infidelity in one discussion. Before me lies a copy of a debate which I held with the Rev. M. W. Green in the Temperance Hall in March, 1878. The title page reads "Report of *an* Oral Discussion," &c.

SUBJECTS:—FIRST PROPOSITION.—"That Christianity is of Divine origin." Affirmed by Mr. Green, denied by Mr. Walker.

SECOND PROPOSITION.—"That the Bible supports and parallels modern Spiritualism in all its phases, teaching, and phenomena." Affirmed by Mr. Walker, denied by Mr. Green.

Now, you will observe that there was only *one* discussion, but two subjects were discussed. The first subject took up five nights, and the second four nights, but we were not discussing the two at the same time, as you say we must if we had only one discussion.

There also lie before me a copy of a public discussion between the Rev. Brewin Grant, B.A., and George Jacob Holyoake, Esq.; and another between Rev. A. Hatchard and Annie Besant. In the former, though it is spoken of as only one discussion, there are no fewer than *six* different subjects mentioned for discussion on the

"Contents" page. In the debate between Mrs. Besant and the Rev. A. Hatchard there were two propositions mentioned:—

- "That the Jesus of the Gospels is a historical character." Affirmed by Rev. A. Hatchard.
- "That the influence of Christianity upon the world has been injurious." Affirmed by Mrs. Besant.

It is now, therefore, all the more evident that you misrepresented me on that point.

I asked you to point out the place where I demanded that you should discuss with me on "Infidelity, Materialism, Rationalism, Atheism, Deism, and a host of anonymous foes of God and man, &c.;" and, after calling this a most audacious question, you refer me to my letter of February 8th, where, after expressing my willingness to discuss Infidelity with you, I stated that "Infidelity not only covers Spiritualism, but Rationalism, Atheism, Deism," etc., &c. With this before me, I still have to repeat *my* question, where have I said that I would discuss with you upon *all* of these? I am willing to discuss with you on Infidelity, which Infidelity covers Atheism and Deism, Materialism and Spiritualism; but I did not say that I wanted to discuss, or, as you elsewhere define it, *prove*, Atheism and Deism, Materialism and Spiritualism. Again let me quote the wording of the proposition. I was willing to affirm "Infidelity is conducive to morality and progress." I am still anxious to undertake the proof of this, though perfectly conscious that there has been much called Infidelity from which I must dissent But to illustrate my meaning more clearly by stating a parallel case. Supposing I were to affirm that "Literature has been conducive to morality and progress," should I not in that have your assistance? And yet the word "Literature" not only covers the Bible, the Commentaries, "Foxe's Book of Martyrs," and Jonathan Edwards's Sermons, but all the heretical, obscene, and mischievous books that were ever written. It not only includes the epistles of Paul, but the "filthy" book of Dr. Child. What, then, because I should be willing to prove that "Literature has been conducive to morality and progress," must I necessarily pledge myself to defend and uphold every book that ever was published? Christianity, you will tell me, has been conducive to morality and progress. But Christianity covers the Romanists and the Shakers, the Lutherans and the Universalists, the Ranters and the Doppers, the Salvation Army and the Baptists, the Wesleyans and the Unitarians. I therefore charge you with being a Unitarian, a Shaker, and a Ranter, and with being ready to discuss with me upon these sects. Not just, you say. Quite so; neither is it just that you should charge me with pinning my convictions to everything that I admit the word Infidelity covers. "What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander," and if you charge me with sanctioning and adopting everything included in the term Infidelity, I charge you with holding and supporting everything which has ever passed under the name of Christianity. This also is still seen to be one of your "daring misrepresentations," and all the more so, since you were asked to point me out the very passage where I said I was willing to do what you said, and you have failed to do it. I, also, leave this point to the judgment of honest men.

You repeat the slander that I am like a "mercenary soldier;" and although you say you have again "fairly proved" it, I must confess that I do not see that you even attempt to prove it. You call my arguments, which went to prove that I could defend the good of a system without *identifying* myself with that system, "quibbling," without showing why they were such. You tell me that your arguments completely confounded me, and I could not answer them; and, mistaking all this for logic, you say, "I now repeat the charge, which I have again fairly proved." Evidently with you, if we may judge by this specimen, to support an assertion needs only *more* assertion, and to justify a charge, it is only necessary to invent others! Such is not the conduct of men with a good cause.

Such is your habit of misrepresentation that one is almost driven to believe that it is your ruling one; for it appears to be impossible for you to be just to the statements of another. "Your imagination," say you, "or the misguided inspiration of some mischievous spirit which was befooling you, led you to say that the orthodoxy which I would have defended would have included the most absurd and irreconcilable systems of pseudo-Christianity." Where did I say this? Again I want the very passage. I said nothing of the kind, sir; and I challenge you to prove your assertion. What I did say was, "Whatever *your* orthodoxy may be, in defending it you would be obliged to defend Those Points it has in Common with the rest of the sects called orthodox." I did not say your orthodoxy *included* the different sects which I mentioned, but that the word orthodoxy covered both your sect and the rest; that in orthodoxy, in its general sense, and not in *your* orthodoxy, were included all the systems cited, and that your orthodoxy possessing points in common with the orthodoxy of other people, in defending your orthodoxy at all (in which those points are included), you must to that extent defend the orthodoxy of the whole lot. Surely you cannot be blind to this fact, for to me it seems too self-evident to be doubted for a single moment.

Your sneer about "the misguided inspiration of some mischievous spirit which was befooling you" I treat with the contempt it deserves.

Instead of having "utterly failed" "to wriggle out" of the supposed "inconsistency" which you say you have "proved" me to be guilty of by stating that Infidelity covers systems of belief incongruous with each other, I proved in my last letter and I have added to that proof in this, that I was perfectly consistent: and to my

arguments you have not even attempted to reply. Saying I have "utterly failed," and that you have "proved" a thing, is mere self-assertion, your unsupported *ipse dixit*—the folly of the egotist, and not the argument of a logician. You should show *why* and *where* I have failed, and *how* and *when* you have proved your charge. If your mere saying a thing proved it to be so, I admit your letter is abundant in proof; but if the proof of a statement means the proper and necessary evidence given in its support, then is your letter most deficient in this requisite, and this point is an illustration of the fact.

Basing an argument upon a misrepresentation of my last letter, you say, "Why, if I did so [defended orthodoxy, which included absurd and irreconcilable systems of pseudo-Christianity], I would be as great a mercenary, as a Christian, as you are as an Infidel or Spiritualist. You say, the Lutherans believe in the 'real presence' as do the Roman Catholics. The Anglicans and others do not. On this point there is no incongruity. Yet, in defending orthodoxy, you must defend both that of the Lutheran and that of the Anglican."

In this you have not only repeated the charge, without adducing one iota of proof, that I am a "mercenary Infidel," but you have added to its venom. You continue:—"Now, apart from the question of fact as to what are the Lutheran and Anglican doctrines concerning 'the real presence,' I must ask did any rational being ever make a more irrational statement than that which I have just quoted? Why, of course, I would only defend what I believed the Scriptures to teach on that or any question of Christian belief; and it would be as easy to get me to defend the dogma of papal infallibility, or any other screaming absurdity, as the doctrine of transubstantiation in any form.

You say, "Apart from the question of fact as to what are the Lutheran and Anglican doctrines." Do you mean to say, sir, that I have misrepresented these doctrines on this points If not, why do you say "Apart from the question of fact?" If you mean to imply that I have, then I demand your proof.

Now, the statement which you quoted was by no means irrational, but a simple statement of a fact: it is only your interpretation of it which is perfectly irrational. There is nothing in the quotation to justify you in concluding that I had said in it that in defending orthodoxy you would have to defend the doctrine of "the real presence." That is a point, I must conclude from your letter, upon which the Lutherans are not orthodox. You would, therefore, not have to defend that, since, in defending Orthodoxy at all, you would defend the Lutherans only so far *as they are orthodox*. The same is the case with the rest of the sects. You would only so far defend them as they are *orthodox*. To quote my letter again, "Yet in defending orthodoxy you must defend both that [the orthodoxy and not the heterodoxy] of the Lutheran and that of the Anglican." Could you do otherwise? If so, what could you do? "Why, of course," you answer "I would only defend what I believed the Scriptures to teach on that or any question of Christian belief." Quite so; but what you believe the Scriptures to teach, you believe to be sound orthodoxy, and to the extent that other people believe that the Scriptures teach the same things which you believe (however differently they may believe on other points) to that extent are they orthodox, and in defending *your* orthodoxy precisely to that extent would you defend *their* orthodoxy. And yet, I having made a clear and self-evident statement of this kind, you ask—Did any rational being ever make a more irrational statement? You then proceed, upon the mere basis of your own irrational interpretation, to build a pyramid of abuse, and you ask—Do you really think that all men are fools in every sense, as to suppose such conduct (as that you have mentioned from the evolution of your own inner-consciousness, but by no authority from me) would be tolerated by any number of men who were not idiots, or, perhaps, Spiritualists? I leave such abuse as this to speak for itself, and to bear its own witness as to your fairness, honesty, and "righteousness."

In my last letter I demanded that you should quote the very passage wherein I stated that Spiritualism, Materialism, Atheism, Rationalism, Deism, &c., were "*equally* conducive to morality and progress." And how have you replied? Have you quoted the paragraph? No! you have not; you have again sheltered yourself behind abuse. You speak of my "theatrical rage," when I said "I insist, sir, point me out the very paragraph, the very words, or forever know that you have told a *liet* either wilfully or in consequence of your logical imbecility." Since you have not quoted the paragraph, *the very words*, you stand convicted of a gross untruth, and my rage, whether "theatrical" or otherwise, being provoked by a knowledge of this fact, is perfectly justifiable.

The following is your attempt to justify your contemptible conduct:—

"This, again, is only another cuttlefish kind of trick, an attempt to escape from your own words in the passage which I have already quoted, where you say, that the Infidelity you were prepared to prove is conducive to morality and progress 'covers' them all; and, therefore, that they are all equally good is to be fairly inferred [I did not ask you for your inference, but the paragraph from my letter], and equally conducive to morality and progress

"If I were to say 'Christianity covers Truth, Faith, Hope, Wisdom, and Love, and is conducive to morality and progress,' it would be fair for you to say that I held all these graces to be equally conducive to morality and progress, although I held the greatest of these to be love; and it was just in that sense that I employed the word 'equally.'"

Now, *firstly*, I did not give you a warrant to use the word "equally" in any sense; and, *secondly*, the sense in

which you have used it appears to me illogical: although several things are equal, one of them is *the greatest*. To me such language seems like nonsense; and, employing the word as you have employed it in the illustration above, I most decidedly object to it being fathered upon me. You, and you alone, are responsible for the use of the word in any sense, but more especially in the sense of its meaning that several things are equal although one is the greatest! Doubtless you have borrowed this kind of reasoning from your belief in the Trinity.

Are all things equal which are included in a general term? This you say is a fair inference. Then let us give an application of this inference to test its validity.

The word animal "covers" all that exists in the animal kingdom, but, to specialize, it covers "man," "monkeys," "toads," "snakes," "donkeys," and "periwinkles."

All things covered by the same general term are equal to each other.

"Clergymen" and "donkeys" are covered by the same general term (animal).

Therefore they are equal to each other!

How would you like such logic applied to yourself? If it be bad logic when applied to you personally, why should it be good logic when applied to my statement?

Having quoted from Dr. Peebles's work, you ask—Do you wish to elevate the teaching of this "spirit" to the chief place in your system? This spirit is reported to have taught—

- THERE IS NO GOD; nothing in the universe of being but matter, and the negative forces in matter.
- ANNIHILATION IS TRUE; or a conscious future existence in the sense of endlessness is a farce, &c.
- FATALISM IS A TRUTH. Man is not responsible for any act of this life. All things, including men and their actions, are fated, or necessitated to be precisely as they are. *Man is a thing* (italics yours).

I will thus state how far I agree with these statements.

1st. We have no evidence of anything *outside*, or beyond, below, or anyway exterior to Nature. Nature, J. S. Mill has defined as "the collective name for all facts."

"Three Essays on Religion," p. 6.

"For 'Nature' means neither more nor less than that which is; the sum of all phenomena presented to our experience; the totality of events past, present, and to come."

Huxley's "Hume," p. 131.

Unless, therefore, we agree that "Nature" is "God," we have no evidence of a God. Mark you, I do not say there is no God, but that we have no demonstration of any.

2nd. Not being able to grasp the meaning of the word "endlessness," no one having lived till then, I cannot pronounce an opinion upon the view taken by "the spirit." He has, however, as much evidence on his side as you have on yours.

3rd. I believe that all our actions are as much under the government of law as the return of the seasons or the movements of a planet. Nothing takes place without a sufficient cause to produce it.

"Man is a thing." Of course he is. Are you of opinion that he is *no-thing*? He must be *some-thing*, or else he does not exist.

Now, what I have just said is purely upon my own responsibility, and not in any representative capacity. There may be very few Spiritualists who will agree with me; and I feel that it is only fair to those who cannot go so far as I have gone, that I should warn you against saddling my expressions upon the entire body of Spiritualists, and charging them with what they may, along with you, believe are my actual defects. I do not shrink from the defence of the views I have expressed, and I am perfectly willing at any time to state at length why I have adopted them, but I object to you making it appear that such views are the general views of Spiritualists. The very book from which you quoted ("Around the World," by J. M. Peebles) thus introduces, the quotation:—

"A French Normandy spirit, claiming to have been in the higher existence some three hundred years, coming by permission of the circle, advocated these theoretical (italics mine) dogmas," &c.

After giving the quotation, the author continues—"These exploded theories, once popular among Atheists in France, are still taught by this shrewd, intelligent spirit." I have italicized the first three words of this quotation to show you that Dr. J. M. Peebles regarded these theories as "exploded." Neither J. M. Peebles nor his work, therefore, advocates any such views as those you have cited.

I asked you in my last letter to be kind enough to quote me "my words" wherein I had confessed that I was "a Spiritualist, Rationalist, Materialist, Atheist, Deist, &c., all rolled into one," and in requesting this I specially warned you against misrepresenting me by saying—"Let me have no construction of your own, but *my words* to express such a confession." After saying that you are tired of doing such things (though you have not done it in a single instance where I requested you), you state you will do so once more, and this is the way you do it:—

"In the first sentence of your letter, 11th February, you say—'I am spreading Infidelity.' Surely, then, you must admit there you are an infidel. [Quite right. So far, everything is fair.] In your letter of 8th February you say—'Infidelity not only covers Spiritualism, but Rationalism, Materialism, Atheism Deism,' &c., kc. Surely

there you admit that you embody all these systems in your person. [Where do I say so? This is your inference—your construction, not my confession.] As you are spreading them all [again your own construction! which I did not ask for, and which is anything but a confession of mine], according to your own confession of 11th February [which simply stated that I was spreading Infidelity—not everything that is covered by the term Infidelity. Again your own construction], and you are, therefore, what I say you are, 'all rolled into one under the name of infidel.'" And without being able to see that you have done me a great injustice in so putting your own construction—which is so manifestly unfair—upon my language, you ask, Can anything be clearer? No, rev. sir, nothing can be clearer than the fact that you have misrepresented me, and that you are unable to quote the confession of mine which you said I had made, but which I knew I never had. At the risk of being tautological to excess, I will use the same logic with regard to you once more, that you may feel the force of its folly.

A being belonging to a class covered by a general term must also belong to and be a member of all classes covered by that term.

The term Infidelity covers Spiritualism, Materialism, Rationalism, Atheism, and Deism.

Thomas Walker is a Rationalist (and, consequently, an Infidel). Therefore he is a Materialist, Deist, Atheist, Spiritualist, &c., &c., all rolled into one!

Such is your argument, stated fairly. Now for its application to you:

The term animal covers men, donkeys, elephants, snails, and crocodiles.

Rev. J. A. Dowie is a man (and, consequently, an animal).

Therefore he is a snail, donkey, man, elephant, and crocodile all rolled into one!

Surely you will not admit that this logic is sound? And yet it is your own!

After getting through the charges of "misrepresentation," none of which you have answered, but all of which you have justified by your conduct, you do a little preaching. Since your little sermon is neither useful, sensible, nor eloquent, and since I warned you in my last letter against repeating such silly nonsense in the place of argument, I shall pass it by without further comment.

You say that I have slandered Paul by referring you to Romans iii. 7, in proof of his admission that he had told a lie; "for," you argue, "if the 8th verse is read with it, seeing it is a part of the same sentence, it is at once seen that he is speaking concerning false charges made against him—things 'slandrously reported, and as some affirm that we say.' He no more imagines that if he told a lie it would abound to the glory of God, than he believes that it would be right to say, 'Let us do evil that good may come.' He says, concerning those who practise such iniquity, 'whose condemnation is just,' and that condemnation rests upon you; for here you are caught in the very act of slanderously reporting what you must know to be false."

Now let us examine this passage, not only in the light of its own expressions, but in the light, also, of other admissions of Paul. The passage to which I referred you reads:—"For if the truth of God hath more abounded *through my lie* unto his glory, why yet am I also judged as a sinner?"

Now, nothing can be plainer than that Paul here says, in other words—I have told a lie! Granted. But if the truth of God hath more abounded for it, why do you blame me? The principle is distinctly laid down, that if the glory of God is to be gained, we should not be blamed for our lies! It is true that, in verse 8, he calls it a slanderous report to affirm, "as some do," that he and others say—Let us do evil that good may come. But still the fact remains that, in verse 7, he argues that if *his lie* hath abounded to the glory of God, *he should not be judged for it as a sinner*, and no amount of word-twisting can exculpate him from the charge. But lest you may conclude that this is simply my assumption, formed in the heat of controversy, I will quote to you the language of the Rev. H. C. V. Leibbrant, formerly a clergyman of the Dutch Reformed Church, afterwards pastor of the Free Protestant Church at Graaff Reinet, South Africa, and now the keeper of the Cape colonial archives. He thus writes, in a letter to the *Graaff Reinet Herald*:—"Men of great learning and irreproachable orthodoxy, like the late Professor Vander Palm, of Leyden, who, as is well known, translated the whole Bible into the Dutch language, and which translation is held to be *one of the very best in the world* [italics mine], felt this difficulty, and could not render the passage as it is ordinarily done. He translates:—"If God's truth is more abundantly glorified by my lie, would it not follow that I could not be condemned as a sinner? and if the latter *were* the case, would we not then (as we are libelled, and as some say we teach) be permitted to do evil that good might result, though those who hold the doctrine are justly punished?"

"If we follow the argument of Paul, we find him saying that though many of the Jews were unbelievers, that unbelief would not influence the faithful character of God towards man. Though *all* people are liars [How could *all* people be liars if Paul were not?—T. W.] God remains the same truthful being, that the latter part of the 4th verse of the 51st Psalm may be always applicable to him. Again, if man's sins are but additional proofs of the righteousness (*i.e.*, the perfect character) of God, he most certainly cannot, *by the rules of common sense*, be considered unjust when he reveals his anger. Thus far the Apostle is perfectly intelligible; but, if he has hitherto spoken in general terms, he now at once refers to himself, and utters the words complained of—viz., that *if* his

lie *has* furthered the glory of God, *why* should he be judged as a sinner *because* of that lie? Vander Palm saw it plainly, that if Paul *really did* say so, he likewise *did* lay down, in spite of his denial to the contrary, the doctrine condemned in Loyola. But, as Vander Palm took it for granted that the Apostle could not possibly have spoken as he is made to speak in the Greek Testament and the authorized versions, he gives the translation as quoted by me."

I have, therefore, the authority of no less a master than the orthodox professor of Leyden University—the learned Vander Palm—for the view I have taken. If Paul *did* utter the words of the 7th verse of Romans in the chapter quoted (and they are to be found in the Greek, the version of King James, and the late Oxford revision), then did he likewise lay down the doctrine condemned in the founder of the Jesuits! You must, therefore, either prove that Paul did not employ the words attributed to him, or else admit that he justified *lying* when he thought he could add to the glory of God thereby.

I have already quoted a portion of the text where Paul says he is all things to all men, which he could not be without lying to some. I will, however, quote the text more fully:—

"And unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law; to them that are without the law, as without the law (being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ), that I might gain them that are without the law. To the weak became I as weak, that I might gain the weak. I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some."—(1 Cor. ix. 20-22.)

In order to save some, Paul here admits that he pretended to some to be a Jew, to others not a Jew; to some to be under the law, to others without the law; and I ask you how could he possibly do so without telling or acting a falsehood to one class or the other? If he was a Jew, then when in the presence of those who were not Jews he made it appear that he was *not* one, he was dishonest; he played the hypocrite, and he falsified his real character. The same argument applies *vice versâ*. Might not Paul be alluding to some such dissimulation as this when he said, according to the revised version, "But if the truth of God, through my lie, abounded unto his glory, why am I also still judged as a sinner?" In the sixteenth verse of the 12th chapter of 2nd Corinthians, he further admits—"Nevertheless, being crafty, I caught you with guile,"

Ogilvie gives the synonyms of "crafty" as "cunning, artful, wily, sly, *fraudulent, deceitful, subtle*" (I have taken the liberty to draw your attention to the last three words by italics.)

"Guile" is defined as "craft, cunning, artifice, duplicity, deceit, wile, subtlety, *fraud*" (my italics). I should therefore have the high authority of John Ogilvie, LL.D., if I thus paraphrased the admission from Paul which I have just quoted—"Nevertheless, being deceitful, I caught you with fraud." I neither did an injustice to Paul nor you, therefore, when I advised you "not to follow Paul too closely in this respect."

I had thus far completed my reply to the Rev. J. A. Dowie's letter when he, in company with Dr. Singleton, called upon me to request my consent to the publication of the correspondence, *without my reply*. His plea was chiefly that, as he was to leave Melbourne very shortly, should the correspondence continue he would be unable to remain until its completion, as, according to his view, it would, unless stopped just when he wished it—*i.e.*, when he had made a shamelessly abusive attack upon me and the subjects with which my public life has been associated, and before any reply to his arguments could be made—swell to a bulk too costly for publication. His further plea was that he had the *right* to the last word, inasmuch as I wrote the first to him; and, so he argued, his letters had simply been in reply to mine. I pointed out to him how unfair his offer was, since it was / who was replying to his attacks upon me, and acting on the defensive, and not *vice versâ*. His letter of 13th February attacked me personally and misrepresented my views and position, and the views and position of others, most egregiously. My letter of 20th February was a reply to that. At that stage I was perfectly willing to have the correspondence published, and to gain his consent or refusal thereto, I wrote to him, stating that it was my intention to publish it unless he replied to my last letter. After waiting for nearly a month I finally received the letter of 18th March. In that letter, not only (as the reader will see) are the old charges repeated, without the necessary proof of them being given, but new ones are brought forward. And to these the Rev. J. A. Dowie has the impudence to request that I will not reply! Could his cowardice, his unfairness, and the weakness of his position be better proved than by his own disingenuous conduct? I therefore warn all readers against any version of this correspondence published by him, since any such version is published without my consent, is only one-sided, and does not contain my last letter in reply to his of the 18th March.

In speaking of what you are pleased to call my "approval" of Voltaire, Paine, and Bradlaugh as liberators of mankind, which I did not express as such only in so far as they represented Deism and Atheism, but which I will not disavow, inasmuch as I do greatly approve of the labours of these men, you repeat a charge that is often made, in these words:—

"The scenes of the reign of terror in France not a century ago, when Infidelity established its worship of the goddess of reason in the form of a shameless woman of the streets, and ruled by the guillotine, until the land was deluged in blood, by fiends like Robespierre and Marat—these are triumphs of Paine, Voltaire, Rousseau,

Diderot, and all that horrid infidel crew who then manned the slave-ship of hell, when it bore the name of 'the Age of Reason.'"

By those who are interested in maintaining that all that is bad must necessarily be the result of Infidelity, it is quite natural to attribute all the crimes of the French Revolution to the spread of Infidelity; but whoever will go to the trouble to examine the facts in an unprejudiced mood will see that the crimes of that memorable epoch were the result of a too sudden rebound from the tyranny and heartless despotism of the Church and State. True, Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, and Paine did much to produce the rebound by cutting the chains that so weightily pressed upon the people, but only the tension of the chains, and the force of the swelling powers of liberty; the oppression by the privileged classes, and the inherent tendency towards freedom of the downtrodden people, can fairly be charged with the excesses of September and the evils of the guillotine. People had been driven to madness by poverty, oppression, and despair, and when at last the door of liberty opened partially to them, we need not wonder if they jostled each other in the entrance, forced open the door without decorum, and, in the heat and excitement of the moment, committed follies and crimes for which more sober men would blush. The tiger had long been goaded, he had been lashed by his heartless masters into sullen fury, starved and branded, and set to tasks beyond his strength; but at last he broke his chain, and in the sweetness of revenge he forgot the sentiment of justice, and perpetrated deeds of startling cruelty. The flood had been dammed too long, its waters had swollen to overflowing, until at last, with a mighty rush, the flood-gates were cleared away and the unguided torrent flowed devastatingly onward.

By such images may we conceive the true nature of the French Revolution, which was nothing but an uprising of the people against despots, a struggle for human rights, a battle for the cause of Humanity. During the battle, it is true, there was much of excess and abundance of fault, but its intention was good, and on the whole it benefited the world far, far more than it injured it. The condition of France before the Revolution is almost, in our clay, inconceivable. Two hundred and fifty thousand tax-gatherers were wringing from the poor the pittance of their toils; men were dragooned into the army, taken to labour on the roads, and when starving were told by the minister Foulon that they could "eat grass." The nobles, the clergy, and the king rioted in pompous luxury, whilst the peasants were dying of hunger, doing the work of cattle, dragging their own ploughs through their fruitless fields, or being shot for sport from the tops of houses. Whilst Louis XV. counted his beads and violated young girls: whilst Madame de Pompadour and Madame du Barry held the reins of the State; whilst the clergy, sworn to celibacy, were giving sumptuous suppers and entertaining prostitutes; whilst the head of the Church was represented by men most hopelessly corrupt and profligate, the populace was wandering through France, from city to city, asking for bread and receiving a stone! Turned into a barren pasture, the people were like sheep, fleeced, till the very skin was cut, by the court, the nobles, and the clergy. And yet you wonder at the Revolution, and are horror-stricken at its crimes! Not a word against the Christian king, Louis the Well-beloved; not a word against the infamous debaucheries of the French clergy; not a word about the cruel despotism of the nobles and the collectors of the taxes. No! the villanies of these were committed whilst they waved unto the breeze the Christian flag, therefore they may be safely forgotten; but the lesser crimes committed by the encouragement or sanction of such men as Danton, Robespierre, or Marat, being committed in a fit of intoxicated zeal for Liberty, should be treasured in the memory for condemnation, for eternal hate, for a ready scarecrow, and as a whip by which to rouse the sluggish Christian hearts to the full bent of a dire revenge. Whatever excesses Christianity, in her maturity, may have committed, they are excusable, for "the flesh is weak;" but the follies of Liberty, whilst she is yet an infant, must never be pardoned, but held up for ever as the detestable progeny that naturally issue from her womb!

Lord Macaulay, in his essay on Milton, speaks forcibly to such as you, who despise Liberty because she has made some mistakes in her first struggles with the demon Tyranny. "Ariosto," says he, "tells a pretty story of a fairy, who, by some mysterious law of her nature, was condemned to appear at certain seasons in the form of a foul and poisonous snake. Those who injured her during the period of her disguise were for ever excluded from participation in the blessings which she bestowed. But to those who, in spite of her loathsome aspect, pitied and protected her, she afterwards revealed herself in the beautiful and celestial form which was natural to her, accompanied their steps, granted all their wishes, filled their houses with wealth, made them happy in love and victorious in war. Such a spirit is Liberty. At times she takes the form of a hateful reptile; she growls, she hisses, she stings. But woe to those who in disgust shall venture to crush her! And happy are those who, having dared to receive her in her degraded and frightful shape, shall at length be rewarded by her in the time of her beauty and her glory."

This same author, who cannot be accused of being an Atheist in the same essay, speaking of the English Revolution, said:—"We deplore the outrages which accompany revolutions; but the more violent the outrages, the more assured we feel that a revolution was necessary. The violence of these outrages will always be proportioned to the ferocity and ignorance of the people; and the ferocity and ignorance of the people will be proportioned to the oppression and degradation under which they have been accustomed to live."

Nor is Macaulay alone in this view of the question. Had I space, I could quote from Lamartine, Michelet, Carlyle, Besant, and a host of others in his support, who give illustrations taken from the French Revolution itself. The great historian of civilization, Henry Thomas Buckle, who was anything but an Atheist, assures us that, "In France, as is well known, the movement was extremely rapid; the old institutions, which were so corrupted as to be utterly unfit for use, were quickly destroyed, and the people, frenzied by centuries of oppression, practised the most revolting cruelties, saddening the hour of their triumph by crimes that disgraced the noble cause for which they struggled. All this, frightful as it was, did nevertheless form a part of the natural course of affairs; it was the old story of tyranny exciting revenge, and revenge blinding men to every consequence except the pleasure of glutting their own passions."

I would advise you, reverend sir, to read in the second volume

The edition of Longmans, 1873

of the work from which I have just quoted, what Buckle points out as the early and the proximate causes of the French Revolution. He conclusively proves, by an exhaustive appeal to the facts, that for long ages the people of France had been living in a condition of abject wretchedness and servitude, that the condition of society was utterly corrupt, and that the people were hampered at every turn by the arbitrary interference of the governing classes. Under Louis XIV., literature was patronized by the Court, and from that moment became cringing and imbecile. Independence of inquiry, originality of research, fearlessness of expression, and the truth about society and the throne became impossible, and the mighty products of genius itself "withered in the sickly atmosphere of the Court." In the midst of universal corruption, tyranny, and decay, even the intellect of the greatest grovelled in the dust and fed upon insipid garbage. But, at last, the ablest of the French took to the habit of visiting England, and there they came in contact with the startling freedom of our institutions, and more than all, the glories of our literature! Thus it was that "during the two generations which elapsed between the death of Louis XIV. and the outbreak of the Revolution, there was hardly a Frenchman of eminence who did not either visit England or learn English; while many of them did both." By this means it was that—though "during two generations no Frenchman had been allowed to discuss with freedom any question, either of politics or religion"—it eventually "was English literature which taught the lesson of political liberty" to them. They returned to their own country enamoured with the freedom of ours, which had not been won without our struggles, and even bloodshed and regicide: this freedom they desired to transplant to their own benighted land, that it, too, might be the home of the learned, prosperous, and free! Alas! for the wisdom of the people in power, the moment these men began to exhibit the slightest freedom in their literary expressions, they were persecuted most shamefully. *Lettres de cachet*, issued in profusion to the privileged orders, gave warrant for the opening of the harsh jaws of the Bastille, into which the unfortunate authors were thrust without remorse or pity. Clarke's "Letters on Spain" were suppressed simply because they contained an allusion to the passion of Charles III. for hunting, thereby reflecting, as was supposed, on the same passion in Louis XV. La Bletterie was excluded from the Academy because he had ventured to assert that the Emperor Julian "was not entirely devoid of good qualities." Fréret was immured in the Bastille because he affirmed "that the earliest Frankish chiefs had received their titles from the Romans." Lenglet du Fresnoy was four times punished with imprisonment in the Bastille on the shallow pretence that his offence had been the publishing of a "Supplement to the History of De Thou." Rousseau was driven from France. The work of Helvétius on "The Mind" was suppressed, burned by the common hangman, and the author compelled to retract his opinions. The works of Lanjuinais and Linguet suffered a similar fate. Delisle de Sales, for writing a work on "The Philosophy of Nature," had his property confiscated and himself sentenced to perpetual exile. Desforgés, "having written against the arrest of the Pretender to the English throne, was, solely on that account, buried in a dungeon eight feet square, and confined there for three years. This happened in 1749. And in 1770, Audra, professor at the College of Toulouse, and a man of some reputation, published the first volume of his 'Abridgment of General History.' Beyond this the work never proceeded; it was at once condemned by the archbishop of the diocese, and the author was deprived of his office. Audra, held up to public opprobrium, the whole of his labours rendered useless, and the prospects of his life suddenly blighted, was unable to survive the shock. He was struck with apoplexy, and within twenty-four hours was lying a corpse in his own house."

These are not one tithe of the persecutions which were heaped on literary men, but they are sufficient to show the ignorance and despotism of the "powers" that were.

I have alluded to the treatment of Rousseau, one of the personages you mentioned, and I now desire to show you the treatment to which Diderot and Voltaire were subjected.

Diderot happened to write a work in which he said "that people who are born blind have some ideas different from those who are possessed of their eyesight." "Whether," as Buckle says, "they suspected that the mention of blindness was an allusion to themselves, or whether they were merely instigated by the perversity of their temper, is uncertain; at all events, the unfortunate Diderot, for having hazarded the opinion, was arrested, and, without even a form of a trial, was confined in the dungeon of the Vincennes."

As to Voltaire, the treatment of this one of the greatest Frenchmen of the eighteenth century, See my pamphlet "Voltaire, the Infidel."

was not only a disgrace to France, but to humanity itself. For an imaginary offence (said to be composing a libel on Louis XIV.), which he never committed, without even a pretence of a trial or the smallest particle of proof, he was thrown into the Bastille, and kept a prisoner there for more than twelve months. Scarcely was he relieved when, at the instigation of the impudent, dissolute, and ignorant nobleman (*sic*), Chevalier de Rohan Chabot, he was publicly whipped in the streets of Paris, confined again for six months in the Bastille, and ordered at the end of that time to leave the country. This was because Voltaire had replied to the insolent query of Chevalier Rohan, "Who is that young man who talks so loud?" by the retort, "My lord, he is one who does not carry about a great name, but wins respect for the one he has."

Morley's "Life of Voltaire," p. 52.

Though he had been granted permission to publish his work on Charles XII., as soon as it was printed the history was forbidden to be circulated. When he published his work called "Philosophic Letters," it was ordered he should be again arrested, and that his work should be burned by the common hangman.

Now, can it be wondered that, under such provocation, intellect should rise against its persecutors? On the one hand were power, wealth, tyranny, and ignorance, and on the other were a keen sense of justice and the intellect of France. Intellect arrayed itself first against the abuses of the Church, and then against those of the State, and in the end the victory rested with intellect. Macaulay thus speaks of these men, who were on the side of liberty of thought:—"They were men who, with all their faults, moral and intellectual, sincerely and earnestly desired the improvement of the condition of the human race; whose blood boiled at the sight of cruelty and injustice; who made manful war, with every faculty which they possessed, on what they considered as abuses; and who on many signal occasions placed themselves gallantly between the powerful and the oppressed.....When an innocent man was broken on the wheel at Toulouse—when a youth, guilty only of an indiscretion, was beheaded at Abbeville—when a brave officer, borne down by public injustice, was dragged, with a gag in his mouth, to die in the Place de Grève—a voice instantly went forth from the banks of Lake Lemane which made itself heard from Moscow to Cadiz, and which sentenced the unjust judges to the contempt and detestation of all Europe."

Essay on "Ranke's History of the Popes," p. 566.

Under the sting of persecution, the forces of intellect rallied, and every department of inquiry, just prior to the Revolution, became possessed by the ablest men. Science unfurled her white wings to the breeze, and she sailed through the seas of eloquence with her cargo of many discoveries. The condition of society became changed; wealth and birth no longer held a monopoly of respect, but were vanquished by the rivalry of the intellect of man.

"The Hall of Science," says Buckle, "is the temple of democracy. Those who come to learn confess their own ignorance, abrogate in some degree their own superiority, and begin to perceive that the greatness of men has no connection with the splendour of their titles or the dignity of their birth; that it is not concerned with their quarterings, their escutcheons, their descents, their dexter-chiefs, their sinister-chiefs, their chevrons, their bends, their azures, their gules, and the other trumperies of their heraldry; but that it depends upon the largeness of their minds, the powers of their intellect, and the fulness of their knowledge."

These events were truly the precursors of the French Revolution, and were such as rendered the Revolution possible. Precisely to this extent was the Revolution the effect of Infidelity; it was aided by freedom of thought. As Annie Besant most truthfully says—"Free thought *did* aid in bringing about the Revolution. It was one of the impelling causes—and why? Because it taught the people to use their brains: because it led them to think; because it roused them to a consciousness of their degradation, and awoke the sense of shame. The freethinkers made freedom possible by unveiling her beauty to the eyes of France. Their passionate cry for liberty—liberty of thought, liberty of expression, liberty of action—was echoed bade from a thousand hearts. . . . But it is false—shamelessly false—that the bloodshed of the Revolution was due to the free-thought which made the Revolution possible. The bloodshed was simply the reaping of the seed of misery sown broadcast by the throne, by the aristocracy, by the church. The bloodshed was the revenge of the suffering, cruel and brutal as was the oppression which occasioned it."

These historical facts you have chosen to forget, in order that you may follow in the footsteps of those who are so well described by the language of Burke, in his "Letter to a Peer of Ireland on the Penal Laws against Roman Catholics":—"From what I have observed, it is pride, arrogance, and a spirit of domination, and not a bigoted spirit of religion, that has caused and kept up these oppressive statutes. I am sure I have known those who have oppressed Papists in their civil rights exceedingly indulgent to them in their religious ceremonies, and who really wished them to continue Catholics, in order to furnish pretences for oppression. These men never saw a man (by converting) escape out of their power but with grudging and regret." And so it is with those who slander the Infidels. They rejoice that there are such, in order that they may gratify their propensity to abuse and

injure them; and sorry I am to say it, but the evidence warrants me in believing that you follow close upon their heels. Like those obnoxious birds of carrion, such men soar high in the atmosphere, that they may scent the foul and putrid evils of humanity, pounce down upon them, and glut themselves to surfeiting; and then, made sick by their loathsome food, they vomit their abominable filth under the very eyes of the virtuous and the pure. Having so emptied themselves, they charge virtue with their own act, and lay their own evils at the door of the innocent!

How truly this is the case with those who charge all the crimes of the French Revolution to the freethinkers, we may learn from the following comparisons of Herbert Spencer, in which the crimes you have mentioned and those of Napoleon are contrasted. The comparisons are thus introduced:—

"The bloodshed of the Revolution has been spoken of with words of horror, and for those who wrought it there has been unqualified hate. About the enormously greater bloodshed which these wars of the Consulate and the Empire entailed, little or no horror is expressed; while the feeling towards the modern Attila who was guilty of this bloodshed is shown by decorating rooms with portraits and busts of him. See the beliefs which these respective feelings imply:—

"Over ten thousand deaths we may fitly shudder and lament.

"As the ten thousand were slain because of the tyrannies, cruelties, and treacheries committed by them or their class, their deaths are very pitiable.

"The sufferings of the ten thousand, and of their relatives, who expiated their own misdeeds and the misdeeds of their class, may fitly form subjects for heartrending stories and pathetic pictures.

"That despair, and the indignation of a betrayed people, brought about this slaughter of ten thousand makes the atrocity without palliation."

"Two million deaths call for no shuddering or lamentation.

"As the two millions, innocent of offence, were taken by force from classes already oppressed and impoverished, the slaughter of them need excite no pity.

"There is nothing heartrending in the sufferings of the two millions who died for no crimes of their own or their class; nor is there anything pathetic in the fates of the families throughout Europe from which the two millions were taken.

"That one vile man's lust of power was gratified through the deaths of the two millions greatly palliates the sacrifice of them."

To this, after some comments, he adds:—"While the names of the leading actors in the Reign of Terror are names of execration, we speak of Napoleon as 'the Great,' and Englishmen worship him by visiting his tomb, and taking off their hats."

"The Study of Sociology," pp. 158, 159.

I think, rev. sir, if you admit the validity of the evidence I have brought forward—and I do not see how it can be disputed, based, as it is, upon the best of authorities

My authorities for the facts connected with the French Revolution are "Michelet," p. 61; Lamartine's "History of the Girondists," Vol. I., Book L, sees. 5-23; "Carlyle," Vol. I., Book I., chap. ii., p. 12, chap. iii., p. 14, chap. iv., pp. 19, 20; Buckle's "History of Civilization," Vol. I., p. 484, Vol. II., pp. 215, 224, 226, 231, 232, 233, 238, 239, 240, 241; Annie Besant's "Six Lectures on the French Revolution," pp. 14-22; Macaulay's "Essay on Milton," p. 19; "Essay on Ranke," p. 566; Morley's "Life of Voltaire," pp. 334-346; Voltaire's "Philosophical Dictionary," and E. B. Hamley's "Voltaire."

—you cannot fail to perceive that you have done the men you mentioned a great wrong.

Voltaire, *le sauveur des Calas*; Thomas Paine, who had the manliness to say, "The world is my country—to do good my religion;" and Chas. Bradlaugh, who in the midst of a torrent of noble eloquence exclaimed, "You ask, is Secularism an inspirer of sympathy; will it tend to regenerate the world; will it act as a purifier of the lives of men; will it make a man fling himself in the forlorn hope? Yes it will, and it has done so with me.

Name one struggle for liberty within the last twenty-five years in which I have not engaged, one great reform for which I have not laboured? When your bishops were voting for an unjust war when your Christian Jingoës came with bludgeons in favour of war into Hyde Park, when the clergy were silent, it was I, the Secularist, who lifted up my voice for peace at the peril of my life. It inspires us to try, because in the very inspiration, in the trying, we have a happiness of which you can know nothing We assail the fort of bigotry, of prejudice, of ignorance; the fort held by those who call actions immoral because they do not comprehend them; who denounce those who toil for the greatest happiness of the community without trying to emulate them; who invent, and then blame us for the invention; who take our views from our antagonists, and not from ourselves"

Debate with Dr. M'Cann.

—these men, sir, I repeat it, have done more good for the world than all the Calvins, Luthers, and Melancthons that ever lived."

I have dwelt upon this point at some considerable length because it is a point on which the clergy often

dwell, and which they are constantly turning to account as a whipper-in to their churches. I now leave it to the judgment of our readers to conclude whether you or I have been the more just as to the facts connected with these men and the French Revolution.

At a few pages further on in your pamphlet, I observe that, following in the usual course of those who feel it incumbent upon them to put down Infidelity at any price, you have allowed your malignity to get the better of your knowledge, to altogether usurp its place, or perhaps to be used because knowledge was altogether wanting. You make the startling affirmation that the teaching of Bradlaugh "commends similar abominations" to those recorded in the 38th chapter of Genesis. Name me a work of Bradlaugh's, or *a single utterance of his*, where he commends anything so horrible. I am fairly acquainted with the views held by the intrepid editor of the *National Reformer*, but I never yet met with a single expression of his which would warrant you in bringing against him so atrocious a charge. On the contrary, Mr. Bradlaugh, throughout his career as a reformer, has advocated a system of morality compatible with the highest refinement and the purest virtue of both man and woman. I, therefore, challenge you to point out where he has ever commended the abominations or similar ones to those recorded in the 38th chapter of Genesis! I insist that you shall support this charge with the necessary evidence from Mr. Bradlaugh's own writings.

In continuation of the same injustice, you still further falsify, either through ignorance or prejudice, the facts concerning him when you say that, for commending the abominations alluded to, "certain of his obscene works have been suppressed by law." Name the works, sir? I suppose you are alluding to the little work of Dr. Knowlton. If so, you should have mentioned the fact and have clearly pointed out that the work suppressed was not Bradlaugh's. Perhaps you did not know that the work was not his, and that he was simply one of the publishers. Then I answer, in such a case your ignorance is most culpable, for it is employed as a potent weapon to the injury of a fellow being. If you did know that the suppressed work was written by Charles Knowlton, M.D., your guilt is all the deeper in saying it was a production of Charles Bradlaugh. Charles Bradlaugh and Annie Besant were, as I have just intimated, the publishers of the work in question, but *not the authors of it*.

But why did they publish it? you ask. I will permit Mr. Bradlaugh and Mrs. Besant to reply in their own words. In their introduction to the prosecuted pamphlet, they say—"We publish this pamphlet, honestly believing that on all questions affecting the happiness of the people, whether they be theological, political, or social, *the fullest right of free discussion ought to be maintained at all hazards*. We do not personally endorse [mark this] all that Dr. Knowlton says: his Philosophical Proem seems to us full of philosophical mistakes, and, as neither of us are doctors, we are not prepared to endorse his medical views; but—[now observe the reason for publication]—since progress can only be made through discussion, and no discussion is possible where differing opinions are suppressed, *we claim the right to publish all opinions, so that the public, enabled to see all sides of the question, may have the materials for forming a sound judgment*"

My italics.

The work was therefore published in the interests of free discussion—in order to maintain the right to speak honestly and freely on all subjects, whether theological, political, or social. Without endorsing all that Dr. Knowlton said, it was the position of Mr. Bradlaugh and Mrs. Besant that Dr. Knowlton had a right to have his say.

It must not be forgotten, either, in judging the conduct of Mr. Bradlaugh, that he did not publish the work for the first time. In the preface to the edition published by him, he gives a brief history of the work, in which it is stated that "it is openly sold and widely circulated in America at the present time." It was published in England about forty years ago by James Watson, the radical reformer. It was afterwards printed and published by Messrs. Holyoake and Co., by Mr. Austin Holyoake in conjunction with Mr. Bradlaugh, and then by Mr. Charles Watts, the successor of Mr. A. Holyoake. Mr. Watts purchased the plates (with others) on the death of Mr. Watson, "from Mrs. Watson, and continued to advertise and sell it until December 23rd, 1876." The pamphlet was then prosecuted, as published by Mr. Watts, but the question of its legality or illegality was not tried. "A plea of guilty was put in by the publisher, and the book, therefore, was not examined, nor was any judgment passed upon it; no jury registered a verdict, and the judge stated that he had not read the work."

It was to test this question thoroughly that Mr. Bradlaugh and Mrs. Besant resolved to re-publish the work. "On the 23rd March they published the book, personally delivering the first copies to the chief clerk, to the magistrates at Guildhall, to the head officer of the city police, and to the solicitors for the city of London, giving notice that on the 24th they would sell at a certain place and hour. On that day, at four p.m., they began to sell, sold 600 in the first twenty minutes, and have since sold, it is said, 135,000 copies."

I trust now, therefore, that you will be able to see that you have done Mr. Bradlaugh a gross injustice, and that if you do not frankly admit it in this case, that you will, at all events, carefully guard against making the same mistake in the future. With regard to the pamphlet itself there are various opinions, and it is not necessary here that I should hazard one of my own. A quotation or two, however, may be serviceable to you as facts which may somewhat temper your future expressions upon it. Dr. Charles R. Drysdale, member of the Royal

College of Physicians of London, Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons of England, Senior Physician to the Metropolitan Free Hospital, late Physician to the North London Consumptive Hospital, and Fellow of the Royal Medical and Chirurgical Society of London, Physician to the Rescue Societies' Lock Hospital, and Consulting Physician to the Harrington General Dispensary, in his little work, entitled "The Population Question," says:—"As it may "be of interest to know what evidence was tendered by myself, as a medical witness, in this case, I will put down briefly what I said. Asked whether I had read the incriminated pamphlet? I replied, 'Yes, some twenty years ago. I had always considered it an excellent little treatise, written by an able physician, and competent, as well as excellent, man. Considering that it was written forty years ago, when it is thought that people did not know so much as we do—although I don't believe we are so much in advance of the men of those days—the writer must have been a profound student of physiology, and well versed in the medical science of his day.' I added that, among my medical brethren in London, Sir Henry Thompson, Mr. Erichsen, Dr. Hardwicke, and Dr. Morell Mackenzie seemed quite to agree with me in this. In reply to a question by the Lord Chief Justice, as to whether there was anything prurient in the work, I replied, 'Certainly not. It is an excellent little book,'" &c.

"The Population Question," p. 82.

"The Lord Chief Justice, in summing up, said that the prosecution was most ill-advised, and that there was not a word in the pamphlet calculated to excite the passions"

Preface to Australian edition.

The finding of the jury was as follows:—"We are unanimously of opinion that the book in question is calculated to deprave-public morals; but, at the same time, we entirely exonerate the defendants from any corrupt motives in publishing it."

You will note, therefore, that even the jury—doubtless consisting chiefly of Christians—entirely exonerated "the defendants from any corrupt motives in publishing it." It is to be hoped, then, that when you next speak of the defendants in that trial, you will not forget that, whilst the Lord Chief Justice summed up both in favour of the book and its publishers, whilst some of the ablest medical men gave their opinion to the same end, and whilst the jury condemned *the book*, all were unanimous in freeing the characters of the defendants from the stain of corruption. It was admitted, and voluntarily expressed by a panel of jurymen, after a fair trial, in a court of justice, that Mr. Bradlaugh and Mrs. Besant had no corrupt motives in doing what they did. I beseech you once more to remember this whenever you speak of Mr. Bradlaugh again.

Let me now instance another specimen as to the way in which you *answer* my charges of misrepresentation:—"Your seventh complaint is, that I charge you with teaching 'mental, moral, social, and spiritual chaos and anarchy.' Well, if your letters do not prove the charge, what do they prove? I will leave the answer to those who may read the correspondence, in full confidence as to what the answer will be, if they are honest and unprejudiced." I asked you to point out the paragraph where I had taught such, and you have failed to do so, but you simply refer me to the whole of my letters, and you ask if they don't prove what you have concluded so unfairly that they do prove, without being able to point out the paragraphs which support you—what is it they prove? I will tell you. They prove that you have been guilty of misrepresentations and untruths, and that when you are called upon to substantiate your assertions, you reply by abusing me! The honest and unprejudiced, I am sure, will bear me out in this.

I could not help but smile at the simplicity you display in your attempt to cast discredit upon my assertion, "Not one of the passages which you have quoted from his work (Dr. Child's) are *peculiarly* spiritualistic." You seem to think you have answered me, when you simply point out that the author of the work in question was a Spiritualist, that it was published by a spiritualistic firm of printers, and that the spiritualistic journals and leaders approved of its sentiments, generally speaking. Having made another quotation or two you exclaim, "Oh, yes; it is Spiritualism which is 'peculiarly' responsible for these 'doctrines of devils,' and permit me, then, to fling aside your preliminary quibble, and to present you with the interesting fact that the whole book is peculiarly spiritualistic 'beyond a doubt.'" So far the arguments in my last letter have not been touched. In those arguments I showed, not by assertions, but by faithful quotations from numerous authors, who were not Spiritualists, that the views of Dr. Child were by no means original with or peculiar to him. And how do you dispose of these numerous authors from whose works I abundantly quoted to prove my point? Why, by such subterfuge as this: "Now, what have I to do in this argument with all the rubbish which you have strung together about Pope, whom Christians do *not* claim as belonging to them; about Calvin, whom you do not quote, and entirely misrepresent; about Buckle, whose peculiar doctrines I am not responsible for, nor have undertaken to discuss; about John Stuart Mill, who was not a Christian in any sense, and from whom you quote nothing; or about Max Müller, Stuart Glennie, Herbert Spencer, or any other of the writers from whom you so irrelevantly quote at such length? Simply nothing. None of these, even if they all wrongly approved Dr. Child's doctrine, which they do not, could make it right if it were wrong."

I did not say they could, but if all these men have fathered expressions and opinions which are the same as

those of Dr. Child, they prove that the opinions of Dr. Child, which you quoted, are *not peculiar* to him, or to Spiritualists, since they are held by men who are *not* Spiritualists! What have you got to do with these men? Why, you have got to prove, not to assert, that they have not expressed the views which I quoted in my last letter, or else to admit that I quoted them fairly and faithfully, and that, consequently, the views of Dr. Child are *not peculiarly* Spiritualistic, since both Christians and Atheists have avowed them. To say you have "simply nothing" to do with them is to say that you have simply nothing to do with those who *prove* you to be guilty of misrepresentation, which is the most cowardly way possible of backing out of your difficulty! Did any man ever hear of such an absurdity? I say that the views of Dr. Child are not "peculiarly" spiritualistic, because a number of authors who are not spiritualistic have expressed the same things; and I either refer you to the works, or the recognized opinions of these men, but in the majority of cases quote the very words of the authors to support my case, and you reply—What have *I* to do with these authors? *Simply nothing!* All right; your admission that you have nothing to do with these authors I accept as a confession that you either cannot or will not controvert my position, and that, whichever the case may be, you have virtually left my position unassailed; and, however much you may verbally deny it, you have therefore admitted that, so far as you can prove to the contrary, Dr. Child's views which you quoted are *not* "peculiarly" spiritualistic!

But really I cannot help but laugh when I see how you continue to row in the same boat. You deny that these authors have expressed the opinions you quoted from Dr. Child, although my quotations from their works supporting the fact were lying before you, and then you add—"Even if they did (express the same views), it would in no way affect my argument." Even if it were proved that the doctrines of Dr. Child are not peculiarly spiritualistic, your argument would still be good—they are "peculiarly" spiritualistic! Should your argument be proven most conclusively *false*, according to your view of it, it would still be a good argument! By this we can gather what kind of arguments you consider the good ones!

But in the quotation which I have just made you deny by inference that Pope was a Christian, you accuse me of not having quoted Calvin, and, what is more serious still, of having "entirely misrepresented" him.

With regard to Pope's adhesion to Christianity, and being claimed as a Christian by his Christian biographers, allow me to refer you to Johnson's "Lives of the Poets," from which I quote the following:—"The religion in which he lived and died was that of the Church of Rome, to which in his correspondence with Racine he professes himself a sincere adherent."

Johnson's "Lives of the Poets," p. 418.

In the edition of his essay, from which I quoted in my last letter, published in the Clarendon Press Series, and edited by Mark Pattison, B.D., his religion is thus expressly stated:—"It must be remembered that Pope was a Catholic. Though he kept his Nonconformity in the background, he had resisted all attempts to induce him to forsake the faith of his father.

Note 350, p. 110.

In the life of him by Leslie Stephen, edited by John Morley, it is stated—"He called himself a true Catholic, though rather as respectably sympathizing with the spirit of Fénelon than as holding to any dogmatic system. The most dignified letter that he ever wrote was in answer to a suggestion from Atterbury (1717) that he might change his religion upon the death of his father. . . . A similar statement appears in a letter to Swift, in 1729. 'I am of the religion of Erasmus, a Catholic. So I live, so shall I die, and hope one day to meet you, Bishop Atterbury, the younger Craggs, Dr. Garth, Dean Berkeley, and Mr. Hutchison in that place to which God of his infinite mercy brings us and everybody.' "

Life of Pope, in "English Men of Letters." pp. 174, 175.

I think these authorities are sufficient to refute your assertion that Pope is *not* claimed by the Christians as belonging to them. But perhaps you mean that he is not claimed by you and your clique as belonging to you, in which case I confess my authorities will not serve me.

I plead guilty to the charge of not quoting Calvin, since I was under the impression that you, as a clergyman, would be sufficiently familiar with his views, and with the views of those who agree with him, to dispense with that necessity; but I must certainly repudiate the charge that I entirely misrepresent him. I intend to support my repudiation with the necessary proofs, which shall be the difference between my repudiation and your charge. I shall now, therefore, do what I omitted to do in my last letter, for reasons which I have stated—namely, quote from the very works of John Calvin himself—after I have again drawn your attention to that portion of my last letter bearing upon this point. I therein asked—"But, further, is it not a fact that the Calvinists, who are Christians, believe that God has fore-ordained everything that happens, and that he has predestined some for heaven and some for hell? Reasoning from this standpoint, surely what God has fore-ordained and predestined is right!" Now, in this you say I have "entirely" misrepresented Calvin. Let us see:—"The children being vitiated in their parent, conveyed the taint to the grandchildren; in other words, corruption, commencing in Adam, is, by perpetual descent, conveyed from those preceding to those coming after them. The cause of the contagion is neither in the substance of the flesh nor the soul; *but God was pleased*

to *ordain* [italics mine] that those gifts which he had bestowed on the first man, that man should lose as well for his descendants as for himself."

"Institutes of Christian Religion," Book II., c. i., sec. v., p. 289.

Here is another quotation, a little stronger:—"Because God, *of his mere good pleasure*, electing some, passes by others, they raise a plea against him. But if the fact is certain, what can they gain by quarrelling with God? We teach nothing but what experience proves to be true—viz., that God has always been at liberty to bestow his grace on whom he would."

Ibid, Book III., sec. i., p. 542.

In the face of these passages, selected at random, can you have the effrontery to maintain any further that I have misrepresented Calvin? If so, what will you say to the following?—"By predestination we mean the eternal decree of God, by which he determined with himself *whatever he wished to happen with regard to every man*. All are not created on equal terms, but *some are pre-ordained to eternal life*, others *to eternal damnation*; and, accordingly, as each has been *created for one or other of these ends*, we say that he has been *predestinated to life or to death*. This God has testified, not only in the case of single individuals, he has also given a specimen of it in the whole posterity of Abraham, to make it plain that the future condition of each nation was entirely at his disposal."

"Institutes of Christian Religion," Book III., sec. v., p. 534.

[Italics are mine in the above quotations.]

Since you have disputed the facts which I mentioned in my last letter, and which I have now supported by the necessary evidence, I will venture to draw your attention to a statement made by the Rev. John Scott, M. A., Vicar of North Ferriby, &c., &c. (as says the title page of his work), which not only brings these doctrines home to Calvin, but to the other great stars who figured in the Reformation. The opinion of Œcolampadius is quoted on the subject thus:—"We cannot deny predestination, and that it cannot fail is most certain; but what then? Is God unjust? Is he untrue?"

"Calvin and the Swiss Reformation," c. vii., p. 250.

So you see that not only Calvin, but Œcolampadius, was a believer in predestination.

But observe further:—

"It has been clearly established concerning three of the very greatest reformers, Luther, Melancthon, and Zwingle (and we know that many more thought with them) that, at an early period, at least, of their course, they not only held those doctrines of election and predestination which have subsequently been denominated Calvinistic, but that they earned them to a length almost unknown among 'modern Calvinists.'"

Ibid, pp. 266, 267.

In a note to this the author says, "Wicliffe also is well known to have gone far in the same line."

Instead, therefore, of simply mentioning Calvin by virtue of using the word "Calvinists," I might with perfect justice and accuracy have mentioned Luther, Melancthon, Zwingle, Œcolampadius, Wicliffe, and "many more" as holding the doctrine of "predestination," and surely, I say again, what God has predestinated must be right!

You object to my charge that the logical interpretation of Paul's teachings leads to the very doctrine of Dr. Child. Indulging in your favourite method of expression, you vociferate—"But you have dared to say, I must not attack your 'spiritualistic' Child, because the Apostle Paul taught the doctrine of 'Whatever is, is right.' You know that assertion to be totally false, for there is not a single passage in all his writings which will bear such an interpretation."

This language is certainly very strong, after I had indicated the passage that I believed to bear the interpretation I gave. But you endeavour to dispose both of my reference to and interpretation of the passage by the following device:—"You refer to, though you very cunningly did not exactly quote, his words in Romans ix. 21, 'Or hath not the potter a right over the clay, from the same lump to make one part a vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?' But continue the quotation to the next verse, and note how applicable it is to you, 'What if God, willing to show his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much long-suffering vessels of wrath fitted unto destruction.'"

Now I want you to remember that my argument for Paul's agreement with Child was based upon the position that Paul teaches the doctrine of predestination; that predestination means that whether we be wicked or holy we are predestinated to be what we are; and that, if the doctrine be true, God having predestinated us to be what we are, it must be right to be what we are, since I do not suppose you will admit that what God does is wrong! Then the whole point lies here—Does Paul teach the doctrine of predestination? If he does, I shall have proved my position. Then let us see if you are warranted by the facts in saying, "There is not a single passage in all his writings which will bear such an interpretation," and whether you have cleared away the difficulty by adding another verse and applying it to the abuse of me.

In order to understand the meaning of the verses you have quoted, and that we may, as far as possible, learn

to place upon them the interpretation intended by their author, let us go back a little and follow up the context. In verse 13 Paul says, "As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." Paul in the next verse defends this, and continues this defence in verse 15, "For he saith unto Moses, I will have mercy *on whom I will have mercy* [not according to merit or desert, you observe, but simply as a matter of his arbitrary exercise of will], and I will have compassion *on whom I will have compassion*." In the next verse the point is expressed more definitely, "So then it is not for him that willeth nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy." The whole point, therefore, as to a man's salvation depends upon what God has decided upon; not by the virtues of him that willeth or runneth, but of his own choice. Still plainer does this become in verse 17, where this illustration of it is given, "For the scripture saith unto Pharaoh, Even of this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might show my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth." Surely this verse will bear the interpretation that Pharaoh was "raised up" or predestinated to do what he did in order that God might show his power! But let us proceed. The 18th verse reads, "Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth." Now Paul, or whoever wrote this chapter, saw, as clearly as I see, that this was nothing short of saying that we are what God makes us, and he thus anticipates the very natural objection to such a doctrine:—"Thou wilt say then unto me, why doth He yet find fault? For *who hath resisted his will?*" Now observe his answer. He does not forsake the position he has taken, or modify it in the least. He does not show that he has been misunderstood, or that the questioner had misinterpreted him. No! he even adds by his reply to the force of what he has already said, and chides the imaginary questioner for daring to impugn it. "Nay, but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, why hast thou made me thus?" It is in continuation of this same line of argument that the verse to which I referred occurs, and it immediately follows the one I have just quoted: "Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?" Now, what can he plainer than that Paul here compares man to the thing that is *formed*, and to a vessel made by no will of its own out of a lump of clay. God is the potter, and he can make whatever kind of vessel he pleaseth, and the vessel that is formed hath no light whatever to say why hast thou made me thus? Nothing to my mind could be more conclusive than that Paul taught the doctrine of pre-ordination in the passage to which I referred. I submit, furthermore, that the verse which you have added does not weaken the argument in the least. It is in fact simply a continuation of it and, with the addition of the following two verses, even adds to the strength of it. I will quote them together: "What if God, willing to show his wrath, and to make his power known, endureth with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath fitted (mark the word) to destruction: And that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which *he had afore* prepared unto glory, even us, *whom he hath called*, not of the Jews only, but of the Gentiles!"

I contend, therefore, that I am on this point also supported by the evidence; but to show still further how reckless was your assertion that not a *single* passage of Paul's would bear the interpretation I have thus adopted, I will quote one or two others. In the Epistle which he writes to the Ephesians, the 1st chapter, the 4th, 3th, 11th verses, he thus positively expresses the doctrine in question:—"According as he hath chosen us in him *before the foundation of the world*, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love: Having *predestinated us* unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will. ... In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, *being predestinated* according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will." Surely these passages bear the interpretation I placed upon them! I will just give one or two more. They are from Romans viii. 29, 30, 33:—"For whom he did foreknow, *he also did predestinate*, to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren. Moreover, *whom he did predestinate*, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified. . . . Who shall lay anything to the charge of *God's elect*? It is God that justifieth." I cannot conceive what Paul could have said to add to the force of his expressions, and to show more certainly that he taught the doctrine of predestination. I defy any man by the use of fairness and honesty to escape from the conclusion that in the above passages Paul most clearly teaches the doctrine disputed, and that to that extent, therefore, he agrees with the position of Dr. Child, viz., Everything happens by the will of God, and is therefore on that account right.

Painful and tedious as it is, I am now obliged to correct another of your misrepresentations. In my letter of 20th February I reproved you for having stated you were ashamed to quote from Dr. Child's book, whilst the book upon which your position is based abounds with the filthy and the obscene. I quoted to you from Genesis xxxviii. 8-10, requested you to read the whole chapter, after which I suggested that you should ask yourself if Dr. Child has advocated anything more horrible than the actual conduct of the villain Judah. The daughters of Lot, the wives of Solomon, and the adultery of David, I mentioned that I might ask you if Dr. Child was any worse than any of these wretches? The slaughter of the married women, and the sacrifice of thirty-two thousand virgins to the brutal lusts of Jewish soldiers, I instanced, that I might ask you—Is there anything more horrible in Dr. Child's work than this? To which I added, "If there be, I should be thankful if you would point it out." I

then went on to ask you "Is the coarseness of Ezekiel anywhere surpassed by Dr. Child? and I finally concluded by asking you to find a passage in Dr. Child's book "more abominably filthy" than Jeremiah iii. 9. To these questions you have given no answer, but by placing a passage out of the order in which it occurred in my letter you make it appear that I had instanced all these crimes and obscenities as commanded and sanctioned by God! To this you reply at some length, instead of replying to the points for the proofs of which I introduced the quoted passages. I say the real point you have left unassailed. It was this: You are ashamed to quote certain passages in Dr. Child's book, because they are obscene. If this *be* true, does it not ill become you to say so, when the book upon which you build your own faith Contains passages much more obscene? Now, you have admitted the obscenity and criminality of certain of the characters and passages mentioned, but you say the criminal perpetrators therein were punished, or that a command from God had been misunderstood; but the most abominably filthy passage (that of Jeremiah iii. 9) you justify by saying "Any candid reader will see that God, by the mouth of his prophet, is reproofing the people of Israel for their sins under the appropriate figure of an adulterous wife, and especially for idolatry." Even so; I still have to ask you, is there anything more abominably filthy in the whole of Dr. Child's book *I*

Cannot even the dullest see, therefore, that you have failed to answer my charge—viz., that the Bible contains passages much more obscene than the book, "Whatever Is, Is Right"? for your justification of them by no means diminishes their obscenity.

But, as I have remarked—and this is where you have misrepresented me—you make it appear that I cited all the cases and verses as God's commands and sanctions, and on that assumption you thus address me:—"And yet you dare to quote this as an instance of God having 'sanctioned and commanded every crime which has disgraced humanity.'" In this you have quoted a fragment of my letter, which occurs *after* I had instanced all the cases under dispute as proof of the *obscenity* of the book from which you preach. Having, as I thought, and, as it turns out, correctly, proved that many portions of the Bible were most undoubtedly more obscene than the passage you cited from Dr. Child, I then went a step further and said:—"Every crime, sir, which has disgraced humanity, *I can point out to you* [not *I have* pointed out to you] as commanded and sanctioned by the God of the Old Testament Murder, rape, incest, theft, and lying are all stamped with divine authority in the book on which your orthodoxy rests." I said that I *could*, and now I will point out the divine sanction and command for the crimes enumerated. I will take them in the order given in my letter:—

MURDER.—"And it came to pass that, at midnight, the Lord smote all the first-born in the land of Egypt, from the first-born of Pharaoh that sat on his throne unto the first-born of the captive that was in the dungeon; and all the firstborn of cattle [What had the poor cattle done to deserve being murdered?] And Pharaoh rose up in the night, he, and all his servants, and all the Egyptians; and there was a great cry in Egypt, for *there was not a house where there was not one dead*"

Exodus xii. 29, 30.

"And it came to pass, by the way in the inn, that the Lord met him and sought to kill him."

Exodus iv. 24.

"So the Lord our God delivered into our hands Og also, the king of Bashan, and all his people; and we smote him until *none was left to him remaining*. . . . And we utterly destroyed them, as we did unto Sihon, king of Heshbon, *utterly destroying* the men, women, and children of every city."

Deuteronomy iii. 3, 6.

"Thus saith the Lord God of Israel: 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."

Exodus xxxii. 27.

"And the Lord thy God will put out those nations before thee by little and little: thou mayest not consume them at once, lest the beasts of the field increase upon thee."

Deuteronomy vii. 22.

"So Joshua smote all the country of the hills, and of the south, and of the vales, and of the springs, and all their kings: he left none remaining, but utterly destroyed all that breathed, *as the Lord God of Israel commanded*."

Joshua x. 40.

"And the Lord sent thee on a journey, and said—Go and *utterly destroy* the sinners, the Amalekites, and light against them until they be consumed."

I Samuel xv. 18.

"And Samuel *hewed Agag in pieces* before the Lord in Gilgal."

Ibid, verse 33.

These are only a very few cases of command and sanction, and if I had time I could fill a small volume with such passages. However, you may see further instances in proof of my position in Leviticus xx. 15-18,

and, in fact, in the whole chapter, which is full of murderous commands. In Numbers xv. 32-36, a man is put to death for gathering sticks on a Sabbath. "And the Lord said unto Moses, The man shall be surely put to death: all the congregation shall stone him with stones without the camp. And all the congregation brought him without the camp, and stoned him with stones, and he died; *as the Lord commanded Moses.*" How much short of commanding murder does this come? See how the Lord himself murdered Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, in Numbers xvi. 30. See the sanction of the Lord, in the form of stopping a plague, given to the murder perpetrated by Phineas the son of Eleazar, the son of Aaron the priest, Numbers xxv. 7, 8. See the command to "utterly destroy" certain peoples in Deuteronomy vii. 2. In Deuteronomy xiii. 6-11, all who worship any other god than the myth who is supposed to give the command are to be put to death; even should the heretic be "the wife of thy bosom, thou shalt stone her with stones that she die!" There is even the command given in Deuteronomy xvii. to murder any man who will not hearken unto the priest (see verse 12). Read the cruel and murderous orders given in Deuteronomy xx., where the wholesale destruction of human life is thus decreed—"But of the cities of these people which the Lord thy God doth give thee for an inheritance, thou *shalt save alive nothing that breatheth*" (verses 10-16). But I have given you quite sufficient now, I think, to support my affirmation that murder is commanded and sanctioned by the God of the Old Testament, although I have but cited the very smallest fraction of the evidence which runs through the whole of the Old Testament. I cannot refrain, however, from quoting another verse, which is from the song of Moses, and is spoken as the language of *the Lord*—"I will make mine arrows drunk with blood, and my sword shall devour flesh; and that with the blood of the slain and of the captives, from the beginning of revenges upon the enemy."

Deuteronomy xxxii. 42.

RAPE.—In support of this charge I shall take Numbers xxxi., in order that I may examine your apology for it. In this chapter the evidence is of the clearest kind that rape is at least sanctioned by God. In verses 17 and 18 we read:—"Now, therefore, kill every male among the little ones, and kill every woman that hath known man by lying with him. But all the women children that have not known a man by lying with him *keep alive for your-selves.*" This, you infer, was not the command of the Lord, but of Moses. Granted—but in verse 26 it is stated that "the Lord spake unto Moses;" and in the following verses we are informed that he gave instructions for the division of the booty taken in war. In verse 31 it is expressly said that "Moses and Eleazar the priest did *as the Lord commanded Moses.*" Moses and Eleazar, therefore, did as commanded by the Lord. And what did they do? They divided the spoil: "And the persons were sixteen thousand, of which the Lord's tribute was thirty and two persons. And Moses gave the tribute which was the Lord's heave-offering unto Eleazar the priest, *as the Lord commanded Moses.*" If this be not a sanction, nay, the proof of a command for the giving away of young girls to lustful embraces, what is it? Listen to your reply:—

"It is only a portion of a dark and mysterious page of human history, the destruction [and you might have added worse than destruction] of the horribly wicked Midianites and Canaanites, who tilled the Promised Land with the foulest idolatries and vices which had ever cursed the earth [excepting, you might have said, those practised by the Jews themselves]. I do not pretend to solve all mysteries, as Spiritualists do [another libel and false-hood]. These events occurred more than thirty-three centuries ago, in a condition of human life, and under a dispensation of Divine government, entirely different to that under which we live [I should think so, or the Fates deliver us!] Such deeds would be wicked and wrong in our days; and we have far mightier weapons against our foes than weapons of human warfare. Possibly, this was one of the instances where Moses did not rightly interpret the commands of God."

Now I ask you for, and I defy you to bring, a single passage from the whole of the Bible where the Lord corrects Moses for having made the mistake you suggest. Although there are many a "Thus saith the Lord," and many apparent reports of conversations and dialogues between Jehovah and Moses in the Pentateuch, there is not one which accuses Moses of blundering, or that takes him to task or reproves him in the slightest for having acted unto the maids of Midian with such debauched barbarity.

You talk of the times being different then. The people were inferior to those of our day: and you admit that if these things were committed in our times they would "be wicked and wrong." Granted—but was the Lord also inferior? Did he not know better? Was he then of opinion that it was *right* to violate the virgin captives? Were the people worse when "under a dispensation of *Divine* government" than they are now under the government of Sir Bryan O'Loghlen? What you say amounts to this:—When God could talk to his people every day, and tell them what they should and should not do, they were exceedingly bad, but since God has left his people to their own resources they have become vastly more virtuous.

Supposing you went amongst a tribe of savages, and found them practising cannibalism and the crimes related in the chapter under review, would you say to those savages—Brothers, you do well; and, as a mark of my approval of your conduct, I take the most accomplished villain amongst you as my favourite, the recipient of my commands and the executor of my decrees? If you did, would you not be sanctioning and prolonging such vices? If you would not, why give an apology which lays such a charge at the feet of your Deity?

The quotation you make from the 19th chapter of Matthew, and the reference to it, and to Mark, chapter x., have no bearing whatever on the case, for neither the Midianites nor their woeful misfortunes are mentioned therein. It is therein stated that because the men were hard-hearted, Moses "suffered" them to put away their wives, which seems to me very much like saying that because the Jews were bad, Moses suffered them to be much worse. "In the same way, then," you argue, "perhaps [I am pleased at the modest 'perhaps'] for the hardness of their hearts [whose hearts—those of the Jews, or those of the Midianites?] Moses was *permitted* to give such commands as in the passage you quote from Numbers; but it does not follow God *approved* such deeds. For instance, God *permits* such vile systems as Spiritualism, Mormonism, and Mohammedanism to exist; but he most certainly does not approve them."

If God permitted the horrible cruelty and wickedness of the Jews, why could he not tolerate a little of that of the Midianites? Why exterminate one nation and honour another, when the honoured nation, if there were any choice, was the worse of the two?

"God permits! Why *did* he permit when he was in daily communication with Moses; was constantly working miracles of the most stupendous kind, and could, either by his commands or by a miracle, have prevented these execrable outrages?

"It does not follow God *approved* such deeds." Then find me a passage where he condemned them. Let me have no general application of some fine sentiment, but let me have the passages where Moses was blamed or corrected for his savagery! God could come down on Sinai to give instruction to Moses how a kid was to be killed, how hair-oil was to be made, or how Aaron was to cut his coat, but he said not a word about the evils done to the Midianites, or to check the brutality of his children. For forty days and forty nights God talks with Moses, and gives minute descriptions of fittings for a tabernacle, receipts for perfumery, and dictates prescriptions; but in all that period he never once found time to tell Moses that what he had done to the Midianites was wrong.

But why need I go to this extent to show you that your limping apology, which accounts for the evil by stating—

- That it is "only" a portion of a dark and mysterious page of human history.
- Though wrong now it was right then, because it happened thirty-three centuries ago.
- It was possibly a mistake of Moses.
- Because they were hard-hearted they were *permitted* to do it—

is not only contradictory, but ineffective and absurd? Have I not already shown you that, in the division of the spoil and the apportioning of the captive maidens, "Moses and Eleazar the priest did As the Lord Commanded Moses?" My case is therefore proved, and it is shown that the God of the Old Testament both sanctioned and commanded rape.

INCEST.—The divine authority for this crime is found in the fact that the book you call God's Inspired Word contains accounts of its committal by several notable worthies (if such they may be called), without containing the necessary condemnation of these criminals for this particular offence. Since you have apologized for the shortcomings of Lot in this respect, let us take his case first. It is given in the 19th chapter of Genesis, commencing at the 30th verse. Lot's two daughters cause their father to drink wine, that they may lie with him and preserve his race. Now, I ask you for the passage where either Lot or his two daughters are *expressly* reprov'd for this sin? In the whole of the Bible as Lot, or are his daughters, mentioned in connection with this crime as being either condemned or punished? If so, where? Give me the passage. You know, rev. sir, you cannot. If ever they were either reprov'd or punished, the account of it, which is of far greater importance than the record of the offence, is not given in "God's inspired word," and we are left to conclude that the old man died in peace, without a sting upon his conscience, or a pang of remorse upon his heart. His daughters likewise disappear from our view, without a word of correction either from the angels, who visited them at Sodom, or from the Lord, who turned their mother into salt. All disappear behind the curtain which the Bible uplifted to show us their vice, but which it has dropped again without the scene of their correction. Until we see the scene of correction given to them, no other conclusion is possible but that their offence received the sanction of their deity.

"On the contrary," say you, "it was the result, alas, of that demoniac sin of intemperance, which Spiritualism does so much to foster in every sense." But surely Spiritualism did not foster Lot's intemperance! He was not a Spiritualist, was he? You must recollect he was such a favourite with his Lord, that two angels had been especially sent to warn him of the impending destruction of the city where he lived. He and his daughters were the only people worth saving out of the entire inhabitants of two cities, if we except Mrs. Lot, who was justly punished for the exercise of a feminine curiosity. Did not God know that Lot was addicted to the demoniac sin of intemperance? Did he not know that if he was not, he would be? Did he not know that he and his two daughters would forget themselves? If so, why did he save them? More than all, why did he kill Mrs. Lot, who, non-saline, would have saved her salacious husband from his sin? If God knew beforehand that

the sin would be committed if he saved him and killed his wife, by saving him and killing his wife had he not prepared the way for the crime, and so far given his sanction to it? Will it be replied, that God did not know what was going to be the consequence of his own acts? Hardly, I think. Then we cannot escape from the conclusion—God not only never corrected them for their gross misdeed, but he gave the conditions which rendered it possible, with the knowledge that these conditions would ultimate in its perpetration!

"Oh!" but you say, "God's curse rested upon the offspring of that sin, the Moabites and Ammonites." And what kind of justice do you call this? The sinners to go unpunished, but their children to be cursed for ages! The mistake in the punishment you speak of is, that it alights on the wrong people. Had Lot and his daughters been punished, there would have been some sense in it: but to never say a word to them, and to afflict the poor offspring generation after generation, does not, to my mind, seem fair. But point me out the passage where it is said that the Ammonites and the Moabites received the "many terrible judgments of God" *because* of the incest of their parents? You should have pointed out such passages, if such exist, to support your assertion; but, as is usual, where evidence is lacking, you think assertion is good enough.

Now, I am going to show you that the Bible gives altogether other reasons for the "many terrible judgments of God" upon these nations. In Deuteronomy xxiii. 3, 4 we learn "An Ammonite or Moabite shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord; even to their tenth generation shall they not enter into the congregation of the Lord for ever." Why? Because of the sin of their parents? No; but "because they met you not with bread and with water in the way when ye came forth out of Egypt, and because they hired against thee Balaam, the son of Beor, of Pethor, of Mesopotamia, to curse thee." See also Nehemiah xiii. 1, 2, where the same reason is given. Another reason is given in Ezekiel xxv. 8-10:—"Thus saith the Lord God: Because that Moab and Seir do say, Behold the house of Judah is like unto all the heathen; therefore, behold, I will open the side of Moab from the cities, from his cities which are on the frontiers, the glory of the country, Beth-jeshimoth, Baal-meon, and Kiriathaim, unto the men of the east, with the Ammonites, and will give them in possession, that the Ammonites may not be remembered among the nations."

Yet another reason is given in Zephaniah ii. 9, 10:—"Therefore as I live, saith the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel, Surely Moab shall be as Sodom, and the children of Ammon as Gomorrah. . . *This shall they have for their pride*, because they have-reproached and magnified themselves against the people of the Lord of Hosts."

Are not these passages a proof that the "many terrible judgments of God" were not for the sins of their parents? I think they are; and to make it clearer I quote to you the words of Moses concerning the Moabites and Ammonites, before they had become so proud:—"And the Lord said unto me, Distress not the Moabites, neither contend with them in battle; for I will not give thee of their land for a possession, because I have given *Ar unto the children of Lot* for a possession."

Deuteronomy ii. 9.

"And when thou comest nigh over against the children of Ammon, distress them not, nor meddle with them, for I will not give thee of the land of the children of Ammon any possession; because I have given it *unto the children of Lot* for a possession."

Ibid, 19

This looks like punishing them for being the children of Lot, under such revolting circumstances, doesn't it? It seems to me to be more like rewarding them.

I will not mention the like crime in Amnon, the son of David, and in the villain Judah, recorded in the 38th chapter of Genesis, because either they were punished or repentance followed, but I will take now the case of Abraham. You will remember that when he went down into Egypt he told his wife to say she was his sister. Twenty-five years later he was travelling between Kadesh and Shur. "And Abraham said of Sarah his wife, she is my sister. And Abimelech, king of Gerar, sent, and took Sarah." When she was restored to Abraham he made this explanation: "And yet indeed she is my sister: she is the daughter of my father, but not the daughter of my mother; and she became my wife." How do you explain this? If it be not incest, what is it?

Whilst upon this point, I would like also to ask you what you think the recent revisers of the New Testament meant when they altered the text of 1 Cor. vii. 36, so as to read:—"But if any man thinketh that he behaveth himself unseemly to his virgin *daughter* if she be past the flower of her age, and if need so requireth, let him do what he will; he sinneth not; let them marry"?

But is not the whole plan of salvation founded upon this sin? Was not Mary one of the children of God? And was she not overshadowed by God the Holy Ghost? If this seems blasphemous to you, remember, it is you, not I, who blaspheme, for you believe it, and I don't.

THEFT.—I am not going to point out to you the wholesale plundering perpetrated by the Jews in those barbarous wars related in the Old Testament, which was nothing else but thieving on an extensive scale, and could only be justified among savages by such maxims as "Might makes right," and "To the victors belong the spoils." I will content myself with the instructions given by God himself to the Israelites just prior to their departure from Egypt:—"But every woman shall borrow of her neighbour, and of her that sojourneth in her

house, jewels of silver and jewels of gold, and raiment, and ye shall put them upon year sons and upon your daughters; *and ye shall spoil the Egyptians.*"

Exodus iii. 22.

How much short of theft is this? It is not only theft that is commanded, but deception; they were not only to spoil the Egyptians, but they were to do it under false pretences.

Do you reply that the Bible is not translated rightly? Then I answer that that is the fault of the Christians; and, whilst the Bible remains as it is, I shall not cease to wage war against such texts. If the Bible is not to your liking, alter it, by all means, but do not blame us if we insist that as the verse stands in the authorized version, which is in the hands of millions who do not understand Hebrew, it is a direct command for theft and dissimulation. We attack the version in the hands of the poor and unlearned, which has been placed there, not by infidels, but by Christians, and which receives the stamp of genuineness by being read throughout the churches of Christendom Sunday after Sunday. If it be a false version, if it be not correctly translated, if it contain passages not in harmony with the original inspired by God, why do the clergy put it forward as "God's inspired word," and insist that it is necessary for us to believe it in order to be saved? This passage is in the Bible, and I maintain that, as it stands, it fully supports my charge; and, as I did not translate the passage, and as the clergy, through all these many years, have not altered it, I do not see how we are to get out of the fact that the God of the Old Testament commanded and sanctioned theft.

"They only took what belonged to them," I fancy I hear you remark. Then why were they told to *spoil* the Egyptians? On this point, however, I will quote to you the satire of Voltaire:—"In vain does the secretary, who has done me the honour of writing to me in your name, assure me that you stole to the amount of upwards of nine millions in gold coined or carved, to-go and set up your tabernacle in the desert. I maintain that you carried off nothing but what lawfully belonged to you, *reckoning interest at fort// per cent*, (my italics), which was the lawful rate."

Philosophical Dictionary, Vol. II., p. 1)9.

LYING.—I am not at liberty here to refer to Paul again, nor to quote the passage—"And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, *that they should believe a lie*" &c.; for, although the lying delusion is to come from God, and although Paul most certainly defended lying under certain circumstances, I must confine myself to the God of the Old Testament. I beg therefore to refer you to I Kings xxii. 20-23:—"And the Lord said, Who shall persuade Ahab, that he may go up and fall at Ramothgilead? And one said on this manner, and another said on that manner. And there came forth a spirit and stood before the Lord, and said, I will persuade him. And the Lord said unto him, Wherewith? And he said, I will go forth and I will be *a lying spirit* in the mouth of all his prophets. And he said, Thou shalt persuade him, and prevail also: go forth and do so. Now, therefore, behold, *the Lord hath put a lying spirit* in the mouth of all these thy prophets, and the Lord hath spoken evil concerning thee." What could be plainer and more direct than this? "Lying" here is both sanctioned and commanded by the Lord himself, who hath put a lying spirit in the mouths of Ahab's prophets. But perhaps the children of the prophets were punished for it!

I think I have now fulfilled my promise, and shown you that "murder, rape, incest, theft, and lying are all stamped with Divine authority in the Book on which your orthodoxy rests." I cannot leave this part of the subject, however, without showing you that that horrible crime, slavery, is sanctioned and commanded by the God of the Old Testament; and, not to unnecessarily increase the length of this letter, I will content myself with one quotation, though many passages might be cited. It is from Leviticus xxv. 44-46:—"Both thy bondmen and thy bondmaids, which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen that are round about you; of them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids. Moreover, of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy, and of their families that are with you, which they begat in your land: *and they shall be your possession*. And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession; *and they shall be your bondmen for ever*." Could anything be a greater evidence of the barbarity of the Jews and their God than this?

Polygamy

"Thus saith the Lord God of Israel I gave thee thy master's house, and thy master's WIVES into thy bosom."—2 Samuel xii. 7, 8.

and the degradation of woman are made so evidently certain and laudable in the Old Testament that I shall not consume my time by drawing your attention to the fact and supporting it by any quotations.

For the sake of tendering you, and those who may think with you, a little information with regard to David, the "man after God's own heart/" whom you have represented in your letter as not only himself sorely punished, but whose punishment was transmitted to his posterity, so as to become the "ruin of his family, the disintegrator of his kingdom," and "a curse to the Jewish race," I will pay a little attention to his case. You say that because of Davids sin in the matter of Bathsheba, the wife of Uriah, Nathan the prophet, in a message from God, showed "with what detestation he viewed, and with what severity he punished, David for these very sins, on

account of which he said (2 Samuel xii. 10)—'The sword shall never depart from thine house, because thou hast despised me, and hast taken the wife of Uriah, the Hittite, to be thy wife.' "But why did you not quote the next verse? Methinks because therein it is manifest that the physic was worse than the disease. In order to punish David, the God (after whose heart David was) determined to commit abominations which were, according to his own admission, much more revolting than that committed by David. I will quote the 11th and 12th verses, that you may see for yourself:—"Thus saith the Lord, Behold, I will raise up evil against thee out of thine own house, and I will take thy wives before thine eyes, and give them unto thy neighbour, *and he shall lie with thy wives*, in the sight of the sun. For thou didst it secretly, but I will do this thing *before all Israel, and before the sun*" Truly this is killing crime with greater crime, and that, too, with a vengeance!

But where is it afterwards recorded that the punishments which you quoted, and those which I have just quoted, came on David for his sins? It appears to me that the original plan for punishment was altered, in consequence of David's admission that he had sinned; and, in the stead of these awful threats being carried out, the only affliction he received was the death of his child:—"And David said unto Nathan, I have sinned against the Lord. And Nathan said unto David, The Lord *also hath put away thy sin*; thou shalt not die. Howbeit, because by this deed thou hast given great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme, the child also that is born unto thee shall surely die" (vv. 13, 14).

So much for the punishment, now for the repentance of David, both of which you sum up in this form:—"God is shown to be righteous and holy, hating sin, and punishing those who commit it; yet mercifully [Is it *mercifully* forgiving, if, as you say, 'God not only punished David, but his family, his kingdom, and the Jewish race? If this be mercy, how do you define barbarity?'] forgiving, as in David's case, the truly penitent?"

The *truly penitent*! So, in your estimation, the repentance of David is an example of true penitence. Pray then afford me your attention whilst I quote to you the Bible account of it. We are informed that the child fell sick, having been struck by the Lord:—

"David therefore besought God for the child; and David fasted, and went in and lay all night upon the earth. And the elders of his house arose and went to him, to raise him up from the earth; but he would not, neither did he eat bread with them. And it came to pass, on the seventh day, that the child died. And the servants of David feared to tell him that the child was dead: for they said, Behold, while the child was yet alive, we spake unto him, and he would not hearken unto our voice: how will he then vex himself, if we tell him that the child is dead? But when David saw that his servants whispered, David perceived that the child was dead therefore David said unto his servants, Is the child dead? And they said, He is dead."

I wish you now to observe the extent and depth of David's penitence:—

"Then David arose from the earth, and washed and anointed himself, and changed his apparel, and came into the house of the Lord and worshipped: then he came to his own house; and when he required, they set bread before him, and he did eat. Then said his servants unto him, What thing is this that thou hast done? thou didst fast and weep for the child, while it was alive; but when the child was dead, thou didst rise and eat bread. And he said, While the child was yet alive, I fasted and wept: for I said, Who can tell whether God will be gracious to me, that the child may live? [This looks very much like repentance, I must say. One might, however, mistake it for selfish hypocrisy: 'While the child lives, I may get the Lord to overlook everything, and not even to punish my child. Anyhow, it's worth trying for, so I'll weep and fast.'] But, now he is dead, wherefore should I fast? Can I bring him back again? I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me."

2 Samuel xii. 16-23.

This, then, was the extent and nature of David's repentance, since we perceive in the next verse he was thoroughly recovered, for "David comforted Bathsheba his wife, and went in unto her: and she bare a son, and called his name Solomon, and the Lord loved him."

And what shall we say of this David, when we find that, after his adultery with Bathsheba, the murder of her husband, and the above *repentance*, he sang, as reported in 2 Samuel xxii.:—"... The Lord was my stay. He brought me forth also into a large place: he delivered me because he delighted in me. The Lord rewarded me according to my righteousness: according to the cleanness of my hands hath he recompensed me. For I have kept the ways of the Lord, and have not wickedly departed from my God. For all his judgments were before me: and as for his statutes, I did not depart from them. I was also upright before him, and have kept myself from mine iniquity. Therefore the Lord hath recompensed me according to my righteousness; according to my cleanness in his eyesight."

But, apart from the crimes we have been discussing, this self-laudation of David comes but ill from a man who, on the bed of death, had stilt sufficient barbarity left to issue the following commands to Solomon, his son:—

"Moreover, thou knowest what Joab, the son of Zeruiab, did to me. . . . Do therefore according to thy wisdom, and let not his hoar head go down to the grave in peace.

"And, behold, thou hast with thee Shimei, the son of Gera, a Benjamite of Bahurim which cursed me with a

grievous curse in the day when I went to Mahanaim; but he came down to meet me at Jordan, and I swore to him by the Lord, saying, I will not put thee to death with the sword.

"Now, therefore, hold him not guiltless, for thou art a wise man and knowest what thou oughtest to do unto him; but his hoar head bring thou down to the grave with blood" (1 Kings chap. ii. 5-9).

What a charitable farewell to the earth was this! Nevertheless, "David did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord, and turned not aside from anything that he commanded him all the days of his life, *save only* in the matter of Uriah the Hittite." 1 Kings xv. 5).

I will now pass to that portion of your letter which deals with my charges of misquoting.

Your apology for not underlining two words in one of your quotations you designate as an accident, though you stand by the result, and defend it by saying, "The sentiment is quite as detestable with them" (the italics). That may be your opinion; but I think my charge is proven, that, whether accidentally or not, you have weakened and misrepresented the passage in Dr. Child by not putting the words which he relied principally upon in italics, as he had done.

Now, after I had quoted the entire passage *verbatim et literatim*, without a single alteration, you retort the charge of misrepresentation upon me simply because I ask you a question upon it in my own way. The question and the quotation I will place side by side, so that you and the readers of this correspondence may judge whether I have misrepresented and misquoted or not:—

The quotation which I gave in my letter:—

"Lucy, the courtesan, is led in an avenue of happiness where her inclinations immediately direct, with the deeper longings of her soul held for a time in check; and her sister Frances, the faithful wife and mother, in another avenue of happiness, where her inclinations lead."

My questions, based upon it;—

"But cannot you see that, in the passage you have quoted to condemn, that Dr. Child has only stated what must be, to all Christians even, a self-evident truth? 'Lucy follows where her inclinations immediately direct,' with 'the deeper longings of her soul held for a time in check,' therefore she is a courtesan. Be kind enough to point out to me where this is wrong? "

The quotation which T made, in full, is on the left hand, and in the right-hand column I simply question you upon it, without professing to quote the passage as Dr. Child gives it, although in your letter you make it appear that I had palmed my question off as a literal citation. Hence the following is only of a piece with your other perversions:—"But I must first require you to omit the word 'follows' after the word 'Lucy,' and to add there the important words which you have left out, namely, 'the courtesan, is led in an avenue of happiness'—a much more important omission than my italics." It would not even be so if I professed to be quoting his very words, whereas I was simply quoting his meaning in another form!

Because I ventured upon asking you to point out where Dr. Child's statement was wrong, you abuse me by saying, "You evidently approve the principle of prostitution, as Dr. Child unquestionably does." Pray, sir, is this a sample of your Christian charity? Again let me inform you that Dr. Child does not "approve the principle of prostitution." He accounts for it, and gives to it what he believes its lawful place in the course of Nature; but he nowhere says he "approves" of it, but, on the contrary, as I pointed out in my last letter, distinctly says:—"Prostitution is an enemy to the good, the true, the beautiful—that are the crowning excellencies of the material world." I can only, therefore, in the face of this fact, denounce your uncharitable assertion as one of the grossest of libels.

You evade answering the question I asked of you by saying that if I put the question in another way you would refer me to the police, just as you now refer me to my wife! But where is Dr. Child's statement wrong? Where has he stated an untruth? This question, *malgré* your abuse, you have left untouched. Never mind to whom you will refer me; let me have a straightforward answer to the question I asked you in my last letter, and which I have just quoted in this, or admit like a man that you cannot answer it.

Your way of answering my charges is altogether dishonestly unique. You are charged with misquoting, and you reply: "But, if any reader of this correspondence has access to this book [Dr. Child's], and will test your quotations [mine], he will find them garbled and incorrect *in every instance*" (my italics). Now, this expression cannot be palmed off as "accidental," for I notice you first had written "in *most instances*," but this being apparently too weak for the willingness of your spirit to malign you have altered it to the quoted form. I repudiate your sweeping charge, and challenge its substantiation. I venture to affirm that I have in *no single case* quoted the author incorrectly, but that I have in every instance taken his words to express his precise meaning. I have nowhere weakened or strengthened his meaning by any omissions or additions of my own, as you have. Although I may have dispensed with words and phrases before and after the quotation containing his meaning, it has only been because those words or phrases were not necessary to express the meaning, but were either introductory or conjunctive. To illustrate this let me take the passages which you have taken to support your charge and compare them with the original, in columns side by side. I will introduce the comparison by

your own support of your charge. "Take for example that from page 19, where you say that Dr. Child writes, concerning prostitution, 'It is a condition of earthly degradation'—and there *you stop without completing the sentence*, which continues—'produced by the destruction of the material world, not by soul comparisons.' This is a daring piece of imposition; for, further on, as I quoted, he declares these 'distinctions' to be 'the fictitious destruction of self-excellence.'" I am here accused of a daring imposition because, having quoted the words by which prostitution is defined, I did not also quote the words by which it was explained! My point was the *definition*—not the reasons for, or explanations of, the crime in question; and I maintain that I quoted the words that defined it accurately and fairly, and that it would only have been a waste of time and space to have quoted words which did not alter the definition in the least, but were employed for another purpose altogether. Hut now the comparison:—

Extracts from my letter of 20th February:—

"The crime mentioned in the passage you said you were ashamed to quote is thus described:—'It is a condition of earthly degradation,' and 'an enemy to the good, the true, the beautiful—that are the crowning excellencies of the material world.'"

The full paragraph from Dr. Child's book, p. 19:—

"What is prostitution? It is a condition of earthly degradation [my italics] produced by the distinctions of the material world, not by soul comparisons. The degradation of prostitution is a phantom of materialism that belongs to self-righteousness; that is produced by the fictitious distinctions of self-excellence. Prostitution, so called, in reality is an undisguised condition of life—an open expression of the elements of existence that are spontaneous and natural, and that are antagonistic to material glory. [And mark] Prostitution is an enemy to the good, the true, the beautiful—that are the crowning excellencies of the material world."

I now leave the reader to judge of the fairness of my quotation.

You continue:—"Again, your quotation from page 41 does not even begin with a sentence, nor end one; but is a mere distorted clip from the middle of one, which is written regarding things which are said to be 'the legitimate offspring of Nature.' It begins with groans and sighs, and then takes in your clips, going on to include, among other 'legitimate' things, 'ten thousand beliefs and anti-beliefs that agitate the religious and moral world,' &c. This is another case of garbling"

Again I maintain that, for the point I wished you to notice I quoted the exact words, and *no more*. I did not misrepresent the author in the slightest, as again the comparison will show:—

Extract from my letter:—

"'The recognition of evil, its resistance and condemnation,' AMONG OTHER THINGS [Mark this, 'among other things'], Dr. Child informs us, 'are the legitimate offspring of Nature.'"

Quotation in full:—

"Groans and sighs, the recognition of evil, its resistance and condemnation; the consciousness of self-excellence and the recognition of error and sin in humanity, with the unmeasured consequences of sadness-that follow; ten thousand beliefs and anti-beliefs that agitate the religious and moral world; misery and suffering, degradation and poverty, riches, prosperity, virtue, morals, and all the excellencies of the earth—all these are the legitimate offspring of Nature. Nature's law runs through the whole. This law is truth, existing in every condition, and in all these varied manifestations." [My italics.]

I have now given the full passage, and it will be seen that I did not do so before because it would be a consumption of space to no purpose. The parts I quoted expressed the meaning of the author *exactly* upon the point intended for your observation. All readers of this correspondence must, therefore, see how audaciously unfair has been your imputation to me of "garbling on this point.

You admit that you have disregarded the following caution of Dr. Child:—"Now, reader, do not go away and say that this book recommends murder." In spite of this caution you still insist that it does. Who should know the better, you or Dr. Child? Dr. Child, who wrote the book, and who certainly had the courage of his opinions—however erroneous they might be—expressly wished to warn his readers against a conclusion that would do him wrong, and he therefore informs us that he does *not* recommend murder. If you insist you know what Dr. Child meant and taught better than he himself did, and that he meant and taught exactly the opposite to what he said he did, you are certainly a more wonderful man than I thought. But, truly, the ways of the clergy and of Providence are mysterious!

I must, however, follow up your imputations. Thus you continue:—"Again, your quotation from p. 166 is only a part Of a sentence, which closes with these words—"They (meaning crime and punishment) are legitimate to that condition of life which produces them.' And on the same page he declares 'there is no distinction of merit and demerit to be instituted between the *good man and the bad man*'—thus completely nullifying your garbled quotation." Let us see:—

My quotation in letter:—

Both crime and punishment are links in the chain of cause and effect." [My italics].

From Dr. Child in full:—

"Both crime and punishment are links in the chain of cause and effect; they are legitimate to that condition of life that produces them."

Now, where have I misrepresented or garbled Dr. Child in this? But in your eagerness to nullify my quotation you have fallen into the very trap you had set for me. You have quoted from the middle of a paragraph, and have not given its meaning exactly. Thus:—

Extract from your letter:—

"And on the same page he declares 'there is no distinction of merit or demerit to be instituted between the good man and the bad man'—thus completely nullifying your garbled quotation."

Paragraph from Dr. Child's work in full, p. 166:—

"The deeper we look into the causes of human actions, the nearer we come to the conclusion that there is no distinction of merit and demerit to be instituted between the (good man and the bad man, for the same stern and unalterable causes of Nature impel both to action; the same God of wisdom has created both, and holds both in his protecting hand of love."

Doesn't this look a "leeteel" like living in a glass house?

"The quotation," you proceed, "from p. 196 is not from Dr. Child," &c. "Again, at p. 197, the quotation ... is from a letter of Miss Lizzie Doten's," "Again, the words you quote from p. 207 are not those of Dr. Child," &c. Well, my dear Mr. Dowie, I didn't say they were. After I had quoted the paragraph standing above, "Both crime and punishment," &c., I said distinctly, "The foregoing is from *one of the notices, as are the following*" viz., those just alluded to. Where did you learn this method of argument and fair play? Surely not under the Scotch professors. Will God punish your offspring for these your sins? Let us hope not.

I just want to return to a point that I did not notice in passing, because I wanted to keep to the issue in hand. I desire to show that, in the quotation you make from Dr. Child on p. 64, Dr. Child is perfectly orthodox, if we take the Bible utterances for our standard. I will place the passages side by side, that you may judge for yourself.

Quotation from Dr. Child, p. 64:—

"And the man we call a free moral agent kills another man that we call a free moral agent. This deed we call evil. What is the cause?—Nature. What is Nature?—God. And is Nature wrong? Is God, the great mainspring of nature, wicked? ... The desires of men, and the inclinations of men, from whence came they?—From God direct and immediate."

Extracts from the Bible:—

"Shall there be evil in a city, and the Lord hath not done it?"

Amos iii. 6.

"I form the light and create darkness: I make peace and create evil: I, the Lord, do all these things."

Isaiah xiv. 7.

"And if the prophet be deceived when he hath spoken a thing, I, the Lord, have deceived that prophet," &c. Ezekiel xiv. 9.

"Man's doings are of the Lord, how can a man, then, understand his own way?"
proverbs xx. 24.

Add to these passages those which inform us that "the Lord repented of the evil that he said he would do unto them," and then set to work to abuse the Bible for containing these passages in perfect agreement with the above utterances of Dr. Child. If there be any difference between the two at all, it is that the passages from the Bible more strongly and authoritatively maintain that the Lord is the creator of evil than does the passage from Dr. Child you have held up for our abhorrence.

As to the passage being the identical defence which was made by "that cowardly and fiendish assassin of President Garfield, Guiteau," you must remember that Guiteau was neither a Freethinker nor a Spiritualist, but claimed to be a Christian inspired by *God* to commit the deed.

I am at a loss to find a name which will justly designate your dishonourable conduct in your attempt to escape from the charge of misquoting A. J. Davis. To that charge you thus reply:—"Now, I quoted with most perfect accuracy the only sentence I gave from his hazy and cautious letter to Dr. Child, and, notwithstanding his misty qualifying sentences, which you quote as my condemnation. I am prepared to reaffirm that he does most fully endorse the whole aim of Dr. Child's book. I will prove that these qualifications are valueless, in the light of his own writings. Are you not now *convicted* of having withheld what you are pleased to call his "misty qualifying sentences?" True, what you did quote was accurate, but it was not even *half* the truth that A. J. Davis wished to express. Supposing I had to quote from Acts xv. 24, "Ye must be circumcised," and make it appear that that was the command of the apostles. Supposing, then, that you had to point out that I had not quoted the passage in full, and had, therefore, misrepresented it—for, completed, it would read "Forasmuch as we have heard that certain which went out from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, saying Ye must

be circumcised, and keep the law: *to whom we gave no such commandment*"—should I have answered you by saying, "Now, I quoted with most perfect accuracy the only portion I gave?" Would such an answer exculpate me from your charge? Should I not have misrepresented the verse? And this is precisely what you have done. As I pointed out to you in my last letter, when you profess to give the opinion of an author by his own words, you must quote the whole words which *accurately* express that opinion; in other words, you must give those sentences that the author himself relied upon to define his position exactly. So long as it does not alter the meaning of the quoted part, you can add or omit the context as it pleaseth you. But if by isolating a passage from the foregoing and following sentences you alter its meaning in the slightest, you are to that extent guilty of dishonest conduct. And this is just what you have done, and what stands proven against you. In my quotations, if ever I omitted the context, it was because the meaning of the quoted passage was in nowise modified by it, as can be shown by a reference to the passages in every instance. In your case, however, the context has been wilfully suppressed, because, if quoted, it would be your own condemnation.

As soon as this is brought home to you, without a blush upon your unmanly face you iterate, "I will prove that these qualifications are valueless, in the light of his own writings;" which, to me, is saying simply this:—"I will prove that my misquotation is of no consequence by making other misquotations from the other works of Andrew Jackson Davis."

If this letter had not already reached too great a length. I would apply your own method of justification to the misquotation I have just made from Acts—"Ye must be circumcised." It would be easy by making other misquotations to prove that this was the positive teaching of the apostles. But I will illustrate your dishonourable method by a shorter example. I affirm that the New Testament teaches self-murder quite as strongly as you say do A. J. Davis and Dr. Child. Do you want my proofs? Then here they are, after your own fashion: "Then Judas . . . went and hanged himself." This is in the Bible, isn't it? Now observe this command: "Go and do thou likewise."

Vide Matt. xxvii. 3-5; Luke x. 37.

Now, both these passages being in the New Testament, it follows, according to your logic, that every man is commanded to go and hang himself. This is after the style by which the clergy prove whatever they want, and which you have adopted to make A. J. Davis and Dr. Child uphold what they only explained, but did not justify. This you have done, too, against the express utterances made to the contrary by these authors.

For instance, to refresh your memory again, Dr. Child says:—

"Now, reader, do not go away and say that this book recommends murder" (pp. 71, 72).

In spite of this, you insist that it does.

In the work of Andrew Jackson Davis from which you have quoted, "The History and Philosophy of Evil," the author expresses his conviction that the view that he takes is not calculated to destroy individual responsibility, cripple efforts at private reformation, or relax the moral power of philanthropists. "Just the contrary," says he, "is the effect. Let it be for ever remembered that *an explanation is not a justification*" (pp. 75, 76).

This is precisely what you have *not* remembered throughout your abusive tirade against him.

Space will not serve me, and time will not allow that I go through all your fresh perversions; but, to show how your additional quotations are only additional misrepresentations, verbally or otherwise, I will select a few of them for the purpose of comparison with the works you take them from.

How glaring your misrepresentation of this passage is, can be seen by the simplest man in the world. It is not "evil" that is said to be "innately good," but "private faculties." Private faculties are innately good, and evil is the inversion of them. Let us continue the comparisons, however:—

I will not consume the time of the reader of this correspondence by extending these comparisons, for enough has been done to show your character as a controversialist. Did time and space permit, I could make extracts from all the works you have called into requisition, to show you and the public how unjustly you have acted towards them. But I think I have done sufficient.

To show you, furthermore, how unfairly you have acted, even supposing you to have quoted faultlessly throughout, in making all Spiritualists and Freethinkers responsible for the utterances of its leading authors, I am going to make a few quotations from Christian authors, and then to hold *you* and all Christians responsible for them. And I defy you to point out in the whole range of Spiritualistic literature anything more injurious to our happiness, more baneful in its effects, and more derogatory to what has been called "the goodness of God," than the following:—

"And therefore I fear not to affirm that it had bene the dutie of the nobilitie, judges, rulers, and people of England, not only to have resisted and againstanded Marie, that Jezebel whome they call their queen, but also to have punished her to the death, with all the sort of her idolatrous preestes, together with all such as should have assisted her."—KNOX.

Knox, "Appellation." *See* Note to Lecky's "Europe," vol. ii.. P. 190.

"This is the acme of faith, to believe that he is just who at his own pleasure has made us doomed to damnation; so that, as Erasmus says, he seems to delight in the tortures of the wretched, and to be more deserving of hatred than of love. If by any effort of reason I could conceive how God could be merciful and just, who shows so much anger and iniquity, there would be no need for faith."—LUTHER.

"The human will is like a beast of burden. If God mounts it, it wishes and goes as God wills; if Satan mounts it, it wishes and goes as Satan wills. Nor can it choose the rider it would prefer, or betake itself to him, but it is the riders who contend for its possession."—LUTHER,

"De Servo Arb." part i., sec 24.

[This even eclipses the position of Dr Child, and absolutely destroys Free Will.]

"Calvin declared that if Servetus came to Geneva, 'and *his* influence could prevent it, he should not go away alive."

See "Calvin and the Swiss Reformation," p. 366.

"I reverence it, because it is contemptible; I adore it, because it is absurd; I believe it, because it is impossible."—TERTULLIAN.

"Take away *Hell and the Inspiration of the Bible*, and you take away all safeguards of morality."—DR. PCSEY.

"The giving up witchcraft is, in effect, giving up the Bible. — WESLEY'S JOURNAL.

"The godly wife shall applaud the justice of the Judge in condemnation of her *ungodly husband*. The godly husband shall say *Amen* to the damnation of her who lay in his bosom! The godly parents shall say *hallelujah!* at the passing of the sentence of their ungodly child And the godly child shall from the heart approve the *damnation* of his wicked parent who begot him, and the mother who bore him."—REV. THOMAS BOSTON.

"Four-fold State," p. 336.

"The rich man tormented in hell 'lifted up his eyes' and saw Lazarus in Abraham's bosom, and to his entreaties for succour and intercession Abraham had replied, 'Between us and you there is a great gulf fixed;' . . . Water boils at two hundred and twelve degrees Fahrenheit, but it requires two thousand and six hundred degrees to melt rocks. This, therefore, was the *minimum* of the heat of hell, whose *frontiers*, therefore, lie twenty-one miles below the surface of the earth. . . In these eternal fires every limb and member of our bodies, every nerve, and muscle, and tendon, every part of us, in fire, over which the sense of feeling predominates, would be for ever racked and tortured, and yet never consumed."—REV. M. WALWORTH.

"No man should rejoice at weakness and diseases; but I think we may have a sort of gladness at boils and sores, because, without them, Christ's fingers, as a slain Lord, should never have touched our skin."—RUTHERFORD.

See Note to "Buckle," Vol. III., p. 248.

"Tongue, lungs, and liver, bones and all, shall boil and fry in a torturing fire."—RUTHERFORD.

"Religious Letters," p. 17.

"Nothing is more intolerably painful than suffering the violence of fire enraged with brimstone; and hell is described by a lake of fire and brimstone, in which the wicked are tormented. Whether the fire be material or metaphorical, the reality and intenseness of the torment is signified by it. But ordinary fire, though mingled with the most torturing ingredients, is not an adequate representation of it; for that is prepared by men, but the tire of hell is prepared by the wrath of God for the devil and his angels. The divine power is illustriously manifested in that terrible preparation; so that, as some have expressed it, if one of the damned might pass from those flames into the fiercest flames here, it were to exchange a torment for a refreshment."—WILLIAM BATES, D.D.

"The Four Last Things," p. 394 (published in 1837).

"There Satan the first sinner lies,
And roars and bites his iron bands;
In vain the rebel tries to rise,
Crushed with the weight of both thy hands."—WATTS.

I shall make no further comment on these quotations, hut will leave them to speak for themselves.

You conclude your letter with a personal attack upon the private character of A. J. Davis. After having cited words as *his* which he only quoted [*see*, for instance, your quotation from "Genesis and Ethics of Conjugal Love," p. 40, commencing "The true plan of correcting the evils in social life, &c." This A. J. Davis quotes as the opinion of a good thinker; you quote it as the language of Davis himself], you refer to his personal history, recorded in his autobiography, called "The Magic Staff." So glaringly and malevolently have you slandered A. J. Davis in doing so, that I will simply content myself by asking all who may chance to read this

correspondence to go to the trouble to turn to the book itself for a full and complete refutation of your contemptible charges. Throughout this correspondence you have seemed to glory in painting your opponents as the most depraved and iniquitous of mortals. There is no colour too black, no expression too strong, no epithet too severe to be applied to them. You have placed them in a world of your own creation, where the dark imaginings of your mind run riot, fiends gibe and jeer, and the sky is overhung with the dismal clouds of moral death and everlasting woe. Fallen to the lowest depths, drowning in the dark waters of the hopeless sea, struggling in the mire and mud—thus have you pictured and gloated over, as you have seen, your foes. Deeper and deeper you have increased the gloom, colder and colder you have made the night, wilder and wilder have become your dreams, until at last, with wild eyes glaring, with harsh voice shouting, and knuckles clasped, you saw your victims drink the very dregs of misfortune, become helpless to the buffeting of fiends, and perish amid the awful thunders and curses of your deity. You have filled their veins with a deadly poison, clothed them in the foulest rags of shame, and exposed them to showers of virulent abuse. The world to which you have confined them is never cheered by a smile of love, never touched by the hand of charity, never brightened by a ray of hope. Dark as the dismal dwellings of the dead, and clammy as sepulchral walls, is the abiding-place of your enemies. From the fabric of a disordered fancy you have woven the dark tapestry of abuse, and you have thrown over the form of innocence the dirty rags from the factory of your own brain. And all this, too, you have done whilst professing to serve the cause of him who forgave the woman taken in adultery, enjoined upon us to love our enemies, and instituted the test of discipleship by our love one for another!

I am not going to say that the Freethinkers and Spiritualists are immaculate by any means; but I am going to say that, take them man for man, they are better than the orthodox. And are the clergy so wondrously virtuous, so angelically pure, so spotless and sanctified, that the records of history and the voice of tradition are silent to all but their virtues? Alas! the sacred robes of the priests have oft been dipped in human blood, and the jewelled casket of virgin innocence has been robbed and spoiled by their licentious hands.. They have fed on the fat of the earth whilst making its people slaves, and they have talked of the blessings of heaven whilst they have filled the world with woe.

Granted that Andrew Jackson Davis was bad, have there not-been Christians worse I Paint him as black as you like, strike him as low as you please, even then, disfigured by your malice, he was not a drunkard, like Noah and Lot; he had not a thousand wives and concubines, as had King Solomon; he was not as bad as the adulterer David; he did not lend his wife to others, as Abraham did; nor did he turn the woman he had wronged, with her child upon her breast, to wander in the desert. None of these did he. He did not even kill his daughter to fulfil a vow, defraud his brother from his birthright, nor dance naked before the Lord. Women with children he had not ripped up, slain a thousand foes with the bone of a donkey, nor won a maid with thirty flesh-bits of the gallant Philistines. You read not of him, as we do of the Levite in the 19th chapter of Judges, that he exposed his wife to a lustful mob, who treated her so shamelessly that in the morning she fell dead on the door-step. No; these are the records the Bible gives of its principal characters, the favourites of a barbarous god, the chiefest stars that shine to us from the dark night of the Bible's youth. These crimes and characters live in the pages of the book you worship, and in communion with them you spend your life. Shame upon you, then, whilst you inhabit such a' shameless house, to scandalize your neighbour!

I am not going to defend the shortcomings of anybody, but I do most surely object to the priest of the kettle abusing the pan. When your Bible is free from the sanctions of the vices and crimes I have mentioned, then, and not till then, can you fairly uphold it, whilst you denounce its antagonists.

As to the views of A. J. Davis on "Marriage and Divorce," space only permits me to say that they are nobler and fairer than those of the Bible. There certainly is much to change in our marriage laws as they are at present, especially as administered by the priests. Woman is not recognized as the equal of man in her sphere; her position is not made that of a companion, but a sort of queen of the servants, who pledges herself to love, honour, and *obey* her would-be "lord and master." And, too, when a man and a woman hate each other, the law, in my opinion, perpetrates a crime by compelling them to live together. Whatsoever tends to add to the misery of the world is wrong—is immoral in the truest sense. If, therefore, the laws of marriage and divorce can be altered so as to add to the general happiness of mankind by all means let them be altered, and that, too, as speedily as possible. "The greatest happiness of the greatest number," with the least wrong possible to any, will be the aim and object of our future reformers.

I have now completed my task, which has often been tedious and wearisome, but which I have followed with an unflinching resolution throughout, that I might answer every point in your letter. I believe I am safe in saying—without a single exception—I have left no stone unturned, but I have accomplished all that I undertook, swelling this letter to its present bulk by the abundance of proofs of my points. To the public, who may read this correspondence, I leave the verdict, confident that my labour will not have been in vain, whilst exposing your foibles, denouncing your untruths, and showing the weakness of your position. Good must come of it, for "The truth is mighty, and shall prevail."

I would have liked much better to have defended Free-thought than Spiritualism from your attacks; but since you chose to ignore my challenge, and to attack me on Spiritualism, I made it a point of honour to follow you, that I might show the public that, whether Spiritualism be a fact or not, such clergy as you can only misrepresent it, and do God service by abusing its advocates. Whether the phenomena of Spiritualism are to be explained by an appeal to another world, or to this, and this alone, I have not discussed; but I have shown that you have libelled its supporters, perverted its philosophy, and misrepresented its literature. With the proofs of these charges made manifest in the course of my letter—

I [*unclear*: in], yours truly,
Thos. Walker.

WHITELAW & SON, PRINTERS, ELGIN STREET, CARLTON.

List of Thomas Walkers Works.

Thin Edge of the Wedge.
Green and Walker Debate.
State Schools and the Bible.
Thomas Paine, the Patriot.
Voltaire, the Infidel.
Letters to the Orthodox.
The Jews and Gen[*unclear*: hl]es.
De Natura (A Poem).
The Lyceum; or, the Education of the Children of Liberals.
The Church of Rome.
Open Letter to Sir Bryan O'Loghlen.
The Reflector, published in numbers.

The Bishop of Melbourne's Address To his Church Assembly, *September*, 1882. Summary of Subjects: *Salvation Army; Parish Guilds; Work of Clergy and Laity; Larrikinism; Popular Amusements; hay Preaching; Duty of the Church to her Young Men; Sermons of the Clergy; Religion in State Schools.* Dunedin: Printed at the 'Daily Times' Office, High Street, Dunedin. MDCCCLXXXII.

The Inaugural Address.

The Bishop of Melbourne delivered his inaugural address, in which he said:—The Diocese of Sydney is now engaged in a most solemn and important duty. It is selecting the persons who are to be submitted first to the Bishops of New South Wales and then to the Bishops of Australia, as those from whom our future primate is to be elected. You will, I am sure, join with me in the earnest prayer that all who are concerned in this great duty may be led to perform their part in it with a simple desire to promote the welfare of the Church and the glory of God. May God grant that the future Primate of Australia may be not less faithful to his Master and not less zealous in his office than the beloved and lamented Frederic Barker. I recently received from Mrs. Barker a printed account of the last days of her departed husband, and I am sure I need not apologise for repeating here one or two sentences of that touching and impressive statement. At a religious meeting which Bishop Barker attended a few weeks before his death, the verse, "To die is gain," was thus read, "To have died is gain." "The Bishop thanked the reader for reminding them of the true rendering, adding, Yes, to have died; death itself is no gain, it is the wages of sin; but to have died, to have passed through the grave and gate of death into the presence of Christ, that will be great gain." This firm confidence in the love and power of his Saviour accompanied him to the end. "After the last paralysing shock to his nervous system, he said, 'I think this shows I must not go back to Australia. I am perfectly composed. I am resting on the Rock—the Bock of Ages. As I have had a second attack, there is no reason why I should not have a third—Ebenezer! It is good that a man should both hope and quietly wait.'" This was the prevailing frame of his mind to the end. His last audible word was "Ebenezer!" There is a divine store of help, he seemed to say, and hitherto, even up to the drawing of the last breath, "The Lord hath helped me." That is his parting testimony to us whom he loved, and remembered to the last. "Our men die well," said John Wesley. And that is no small thing; for no man can well be false when he is consciously passing into the presence of Eternal Truth. May God enable each of us to keep the like unswerving faith, and to deliver the like parting testimony. "Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his." I desire at the very beginning of this address to thank many generous laymen, and

especially Mr. Ormond, whose noble offer gave us all so powerful a stimulus, for their liberal donations to our Cathedral Fund. The building, as you see, is rapidly progressing, and is already developing a chaste grandeur of form and a balanced fitness of details, which few of us had realised from an inspection of the rough plans which were at first laid before us. It is not, however, for the beauty and harmony of its design that we shall principally value it, but rather for those great spiritual uses to which we hope to make it subservient. As a school of preaching, of divinity, of sacred song, and as the natural centre of our Diocesan Services, Societies, and Organisation, it will supply a felt want, and stimulate, we trust, a larger and more effective activity. The mention of the Cathedral naturally suggests Trinity College, and the generous benefaction of Mr. Joseph Clarke, which has enabled us to proceed to the erection of much-needed additions to the building. Plans have been prepared on a comprehensive scale by Mr. Blackett, of Sydney. These, I believe, have given general satisfaction, and it is the first portion of this large design which we are now beginning to carry out. More and more, as I realise the work to be done in this colony, I become convinced that we must train our own clergy. Colonial youths understand the life of our people, and not only more readily conform to its conditions, but also more easily resist its temptations. It is to be confessed, however, that at present candidates for our theological scholarships are neither so numerous nor so well-prepared as we could desire. There must be many young men in Melbourne employed in various ways—as clerks especially—who, if they could procure efficient tuition without leaving their ordinary work would gladly give themselves to the great work of the Ministry. The Warden of Trinity College and I held recently a consultation on this subject, and he has kindly promised to give such facilities as those to which I have referred, to any who may desire to enter upon preliminary study for holy orders. Mr. Leeper informs me that almost all the subjects of the Arts course are taught in the College, and that as the whole of the lecturing is done at night, men who are precluded by the nature of their occupation from attending University lectures, would receive all the assistance they need in preparing for examination. The whole of the expense incurred in following such a course would be £20 a year, as Mr. Leeper generously offers to admit non-resident theological students to the College lectures at one-third of the ordinary charges. This £20 a year would cover University fees, College fees, and the cost of books, and would enable a young man to obtain a degree at the University without further expense. Mr. Leeper only stipulates that such students should show at a preliminary examination that they have knowledge and ability enough to make it probable that they will be able to obtain a degree. Of course the abler and better prepared of these students would gain our theological scholarships as they fell vacant, and so passing into residence would obtain the full advantage of College society and discipline. The offer of these great advantages is now made to the pious young churchmen of this diocese, and many, I trust, will be found to claim them at once. The terms are easy, and it is not impossible that promising students, who are too poor to bear even these light charges, may obtain some slight help from church funds. We have just held our Annual Meeting in connection with the Bishop of Melbourne's Fund, and I will only now remind you shortly of certain facts which were there set forth in detail. This is the only general fund of the diocese. If, therefore, any churchman fail to contribute to its support, he is practically ignoring his churchmanship, and acting simply as if he were a member of a small congregation. Again the contributions to this fund are all voluntary, so that if they be suffered to fail or fall short in any single year, the effect must be either a total abandonment of some of our work or a reduction of the stipends of 48 of our country clergy, and of 40—that is of the whole body—of our readers; a reduction, that is to say, of the stipends of those who can barely live and pay their way as matters now are. I have to congratulate you on the large increase to this fund which was exhibited by our last year's Report, and to beseech you to be unremitting in your endeavours to sustain, and, if possible, to augment that increase. This is far the most important of the funds in connection with our church, for any serious failure here would inflict a paralysing blow on the efficiency of our whole organisation. We have heard much of late about the doings at Home of the Salvation Army, and much, in spite of what may be good in that organisation, to cause sober Christians pain, and to make them anxious about its possible future. Doctrines are being taught which we cannot regard as scriptural. Excitement is being encouraged which is not healthy, which may lead to excess, and which must lead to re-action. Wild dances and wilder cries are permitted, which border on profanity. Midnight meetings of both sexes are encouraged, which must be fraught with danger. On all these accounts we cannot view the movement without the gravest misgivings. But when we remember the millions of working men and their families who are living in secular animalism, without God in the world, it is impossible to say to earnest men give up your agitation, or even to condemn unconditionally measures which have attained some degree of success where we have failed. One thing, however, I can see plainly—that the ways of the Salvation Army are not our ways; that between the sweet, sober piety of the English Church and the unbridled excitement of the jumping, shouting crowds of converted roughs and "Hallelujah lasses," there is a great gulf fixed. We may pray God to help and guide them, and to deliver them from their too obvious dangers, but imitate them we cannot. At the same time, it is surely lawful and necessary to learn from them. Do they not teach us outward lessons as these? The value of popular and emotional forms of address, or outward symbols and watchwords, of closer organisation and

fellowship, of enlisting every individual in aggressive work; above all, of the power of prayer and praise, and of the holy enthusiasm kindled by these to touch with contagious force the torpid souls of the indifferent? Let us lay these lessons to heart, my brethren, and ask God to show us how we may best turn them to account within the limits of our own more sober, and, as I believe, more scriptural system. Bishop Thorold used words in his last charge as wise as they are stirring. "If we would not see the mass of the working people," he said, "hopelessly surrendered either to a gross animalism or a dismal unbelief, we must throw our prejudices to the wind, and organise a brotherhood of Christian workers, which, with simple creed, resolute purpose, real sacrifice, and fervent devotion, shall march under the church's banner, and preach her gospel for the salvation of souls to Christ." These words point to comprehensive organisation, and indicate, I believe, one of the great wants of our church. I would say to each parish clergyman—aim at supplying all the wants, and enlisting all the workers of your parish. The more works you start the more workers you will want, and the more you will get. How often I have heard it said by energetic laymen—there is nothing for me to do in the Church of England. Why? Because nothing needs to be done. Ask your own conscience, my brethren. At the taking of the last census nearly 300,000 people—more than a third of our whole population—set themselves down as belonging to the Church of England. For the supply of the spiritual wants of these we are clearly responsible. But is there one of us who thinks that we are approaching to an efficient discharge of this duty? Let each parish clergyman say to himself—One-third of the people here (such is the average) declare that they belong to me. What are their wants, then, for body and soul? What are the needs of parents, of children, of young men of young women? How can I supply to all these classes relief in distress, institutions for the promotion of temperance and economy, amusement for their leisure, instruction for their intellect, food for their heart? By so much as I fall short of doing this I fall short of doing my duty. I do not like to speak of my own experience, brethren; but I may mention, for the encouragement of others, that when I was incumbent of St. John's, Fitzroy-square, with a population of 14,000 poor people, and without either parsonage or endowment, I found it possible to organise societies for all the objects I have named, and it was my experience that as I multiplied works. I increased workers, and stimulated zeal and confidence. What indeed can resist a body of men, warmed by mutual sympathy, encouraged by the sense of support, and animated by the feeling that they have got a grip of their whole task, and are by God's blessing mastering it? Let me just transcribe for you the account of what has been done by such comprehensive organisation at St. Alphege's, Southwark. Eight years ago the mission was started in one of the most abjectly destitute parts of London, and in five years it had collected a congregation of more than 1000 souls, with from 300 to 400 communicants. The incumbent describes his work as follows:—"Every hour of the day from 6 in the morning till 11 at night, is either taken up in cheering the hearts of weary workers or in seeking the careless, or in consoling, encouraging, and rebuking such as have been brought to God. There is the daily supervision of our Training College, our College Schools, National Schools, Boys' Home, Children's Kitchen, Crèche, District Visitors' Work, Clubs, Bible Classes—(I have between 300 and 400 men and women attending my two classes),—accounts of moneys received and paid, &c. Yet in the spiritual work there is happiness, and encouragement and pleasure in the temporal." So much may be done by comprehensive organisation, Amongst the various institutions for the organisation of lay help, guilds in many parishes are taking a prominent place. Some of our old friends here may possibly have to get over a natural prejudice against the word "guild." It has a mediæval sound, which seems to connect it in some way with the Roman Church. The association, however, is misleading. It comes from an Anglo-Saxon word meaning "to pay;" because the original Saxon guilds of 10 families contributed to a common guarantee fund intended to pay the legal fines which might be incurred by any of their criminous, members. Hence merchant guilds, with their guild-halls; and hence, too, ecclesiastical guilds. The word is better than "club," which would carry misleading associations, but it is not far from being the ecclesiastical equivalent of that word. A parochial guild has this great advantage—it gathers into a felt and recognised unity, with all the concomitant advantages of sympathy, close friendship, and the inspiration of members, persons who engaged in separate parochial labours, might never get beyond individualism, with its isolation, caprices, and tendency to ebbing energy and interest. Again, it finds a home and furnishes direction to young people who have few, if any, friends to encourage them in holy living and working. Its bond of union is commonly the promise to lead a godly life, and to seek help to this end in regular worship and attendance at Holy Communion. Its work embraces choir duties, night schools, Sunday schools, youths' clubs, sewing classes, mothers' meetings, Bible classes, and visiting those who stand in need of visitation, as the sick and needy, the parents of school children, the unconfirmed, those lately confirmed, families visited by death, hospitals, gaols, workhouses, and penitentiaries. Members of guilds also employ themselves in getting up concerts and readings for the poor, in managing burial clubs, clothing clubs, book clubs, and penny banks; as also in organising meetings for the promotion of good works, and in attending and speaking at such meetings, and last, not least, in endeavouring to procure work for fellow-guildsmen, for penitent women, and for godly people who have fallen into distress. I have been thus particular in specifying various kinds of work, because I have found that people in these colonies have been deterred from forming

guilds by ignorance of their possible objects. A word upon amusements is naturally suggested by such an enumeration of good works as that which I have just made. The question of popular amusements seems to me, in the presence of our continually increasing larrikinism, one of the greatest urgency. It is not to be solved by silly declamation and furious puritanical abuse of every one who tries to make our amusements a little more reasonable and elevating. I have formerly expressed the opinion that our people devote far too much of their time and money to the pursuit of pleasure, and I have seen no reason since then, I am sorry to say, to alter my opinion. But we shall not improve the people's amusement by simply cursing them, and passing by on the other side. "The question is," says Karl Hillebrand, "how to employ the leisure hours of uneducated and half-educated people who must always remain such." It is clearly a difficult question, and one which, with the shortening of the hours of labour, is becoming more difficult every day. We may possibly attract the *élite* of our workmen into Working Men's Colleges, Church Guilds, and Christian Young Men's Societies. But what of the great mass who can find pleasure neither in reading nor thinking, and what, moreover, of the large number of married workmen who cannot satisfy themselves with the pure and quiet pleasures of home? Karl Hillebrand suggests "some kind of secondary employment, which shall bring in some small profit, and shall not be fatiguing. In Sheffield, in my early days, large numbers of workmen were kept from the public-houses, and greatly improved both in health and pocket, by renting and cultivating small garden-plots on which they raised vegetables for household use, and grew the simple flowers of country gardens. I fear that Australians might object to the work which this healthy and humanising amusement might cost them, and that they will be found to prefer the spectacle of a game of cricket or football. Could they, however, get over their first disinclination, I am persuaded that they would find both health and pleasure in garden work. Music is attractive to ton population of a sunny land like ours, and I would suggest to the clergy that young men who care nothing for study are often found to take pleasure in concerted music, and readily join brass bands, string bands, or drum and fife bands, which meet for practice in school buildings. Mr. Gosman recently suggested that a volunteer cadet corps might be organised in different neighbourhoods for rifle practice and drill, and I certainly cannot see why the rifle-butts and the drill-ground should not prove as attractive in our time as did the archery-butts on the village green in the days of our forefathers. There is use as well as amusement in such exercises as these, and young men would be sensible of this, and find in it a stimulus to perseverance. Again, for older men, parochial clubs are often found to be useful. I once furnished some rooms for such a purpose, which included billiard-rooms, refreshment bar for coffee and tea, large reading-hall, and rooms for the meetings of sick and benefit societies. Smoking was allowed, and we soon nearly emptied some of the drinking places, and were heartily thanked by the wives of working men for preserving the health and substance of their husbands, and for sending them home in their right mind, and with their wages to their pocket. The mention of my own club reminds me of the care taken to promote harmless amusements in the parish of St. Peter's, London Docks. You will remember, perhaps, what a wonderful work was done there, how all the people were made to love the church, how 500 communicants were gathered from amongst one of the lowest populations in London, and how the clergy could say at last, of a district which had been a sink of impurity, "not only has open professional sin been swept away from the streets of St. Peter's; but besides, there is not one known house of ill-fame in the whole parish"—though such places swarmed round all its borders. It is interesting to ask how men who achieve such results dealt with the question of amusement. Here is their account of it:—"In the evening the men fill the new schoolroom, smoking, reading, playing bagatelle (there are two good tables) or skittles, or racing in the running-ground outside. On Wednesday evenings the desks are cleared, and the neighbours pour in for the weekly concert, which once a month resolves itself into a ball. The drum and fife band practices twice a week, as also the stringed-instrument band. In the winter there are all sorts of things going on—theatricals, nigger entertainments; anything to keep them out of the public-houses and out of the streets." The lads' club, which devoted itself principally to athletics was under the superintendence of a paid officer, known as the "chucker out," and, says the author of the account from which I am quoting, "No boys' club in the east of London can possibly exist without such a functionary." There is one passage more in connection with these entertainments which I must transcribe for you, lest any one should imagine that the conduct of such amusements is easy or without sore trials:—"Those who have had to do with this sort of thing will know something of the disappointments, rebellions discouragements, ingratitude, and failures, that have to be patiently borne with and triumphed over. . . Perseverance is the secret of success in such work, of course, under the blessing of God. We hear much of the success of the modern church movement in England; but do we consider enough the price paid for it—the energy, courage, patience, and dogged determination required in order to secure it? That is the way, depend upon it, and the only way, to conquer Melbourne larrikinism and to sanctify the overwhelming wild energy, which boils over in its excesses. Who has greatness of heart enough to try it on a large scale? I turn next to the subject of Sunday-schools. The clergy, especially in country districts, can very seldom teach in the Sunday-schools. If, therefore, they fail to give instruction to the teachers, their influence of a didactic kind can scarcely be said to reach the minds of the children at all. For this and other reasons I say unhesitatingly, that

there should be no parish in the diocese without a Sunday-school teachers' class, conducted by the clergyman. Many indirect advantages are secured by the holding of such a class. Opportunity is afforded to the clergyman for answering questions, for discussing difficulties of practical management, for deepening sympathy between himself and his fellow-labourers, and for drawing closer the bond of brotherly feeling between those who are actively labouring for the spread of Christ's kingdom. I observe (from returns made to the Sunday-school Association) that in some cases teachers' classes have been started, and then abandoned for lack of attendance. Was care always taken, I wonder, in these cases to make the class interesting? Nothing can succeed which is allowed to drop into a monotonous uniformity. I would suggest, then, that the ordinary routine of Scriptural exposition might, with advantage, be interrupted from time to time by a social meeting, where, with the help of music, bright talk, and perhaps with one or two short pithy addresses, the teachers might spend a pleasant evening, and realise the fact that Christian brotherhood meant something more than mere community of labour. Again, if I may judge from my own early experience, it would add greatly both to the interest of such meetings, and to the love of their members for the church of their fathers, if from time to time the clergyman would give a short course of lessons on the church's manual of devotion, the Book of Common Prayer. I believe there is not one churchman in a hundred who has carefully considered either the history or the composition of those prayers and praises which he takes into his lips every Sunday. Unconsciously, perhaps, we feel the elevation of their thought, and the charm of their exquisite language, but how little do we ordinarily realise of the variety, the profundity, the comprehensiveness of their petitions, of the dominant purpose of worship which determines their arrangement, or of the solemn and tender associations which cluster round their origin and history. From Freeman and Palmer and Proctor, all this might be easily learnt, and be made, with care and pains, both a means of profit and a source of the deepest interest. A respected clergyman of this diocese, whose name were I at liberty to mention it would lend great weight to his judgment, stated recently "that eight out of ten male scholars leave school about 15, unconfirmed, and never go any more, either to church or Sunday-school" Such an experience as this can scarcely be general; but if even it be not uncommon is it not one of the most terrible facts with which we could be confronted? Does it not mean that the church is largely losing her young men, and that she ought to stick at no sacrifice and no toil to stop so fatal a leakage? To some of the subjects of a Bishop's address you might be disposed, perhaps, to give but a perfunctory attention, but the man who fails to give his best thought to a fact of this gravity, proves himself, *ipso facto*, to have no real case either for the Master whom he serves, or the church to which he belongs. Why, then, let us ask, do so many of our boys drift away from church on leaving school? This is a wide question, and one which may not admit of a simple answer, seeing that the causes in operation are many and diverse. People point to the prevailing scepticism, the precocity of our youths, their spurious independence arising from defect of home influence, and the attractions of outdoor life in a genial climate. No doubt each of these causes has its influence. But surely we cannot say that a youth is specially sceptical who has for years attended a Sunday-school class, where he has received intelligent instruction. Surely, again, if he resisted the snares of spurious independence till he was 15 years of age, we are not to suppose a sudden access of that infirmity in all cases. What, then, is the last straw which breaks the camel's back? Suppose it to be granted that a youth has been tugging for some time at the elastic band of mingled duty and affection which bound him to the church, what stimulates those final desperate efforts by which he breaks it? More than one thing, perhaps, again. Still, let us try to discover those circumstances which are likely to have had most influence. With growing years there is in every boy a double development—of will and of intellect. The expanding intellect demands enlargement and satisfaction. New questions are arising in the soul, and a quickening curiosity to explore unknown realms of thought and knowledge. Is provision generally made in our Sunday-schools to meet this need? We talk about wanting employment for our laity. Well let me ask this, and let me ask it of my lay brethren who are just as much bound to extend the kingdom of Christ, according to their opportunities, as I am:—Are our most intelligent laymen ready, first, either to build separate class rooms for adult scholars, or to take classes of such to their own houses for instruction? and secondly, are such laymen ready, nay anxious, to make such a book as Farrar's *History of St. Paul*, the basis of study for advanced lessons, or to give such instruction in the wonders of God's works as shall naturally lead the mind of an intelligent youth to the Divine Creator of all that is good and beautiful, supplementing such lessons, as occasion shall serve, by trips of a semi-scientific character to the habitat of a plant, or the exposure of a geologic formation? No one can conceive the blessedness and the blessing of such work as this, unless he has attempted it. But besides the growth of understanding in boys, there is, as I have said, a development of will, of the sense of self-dependence and personal dignity, which must to a certain extent be respected. Now, how does the church try to meet this? I believe that as a rule it does not try at all, and so necessarily does harm. Young men, like young nations, are very sensitive. They suspect that their youth may be despised, and are constantly on the watch for signs which may justify such a suspicion. Hence, the necessity for great and even tender consideration on the part of their elders. Now, there are many boys in the senior classes of our Sunday-schools, whose parents do not attend church. Consequently they have no seats provided for them,

apart from the school, even if they desire to continue their attendance. They have grown too old to relish the company of little boys, and if they separate themselves from the school they find themselves thrust into corners, and treated as if they were of small account—the very thing which provokes their developing manhood to dislike and resistance. You may say, perhaps, that this is a necessary result of our pew system, and that on the whole it is not desirable to abandon that system. I am certainly not prepared to advise its abandonment at present, but this I do say most emphatically, that if we keep the pew system, free pews should be reserved in a good place—pews just like the others in appearance, for the elder scholars of our Sunday-schools. Vestrymen, I know, sometimes talk about loss of funds, but even on this low ground—and it is so low as to be almost beneath consideration, when regard is had to the interests involved—can it be good policy to drive away from church, at the most susceptible period of their life, those who, if loved and cared for, would become our best and most valuable supporters? I do hope that at least in this respect we shall endeavour to reform our treatment of elder scholars. In connection with this subject, I would just repeat the suggestion which I have offered once before, that a very strenuous effort be made to keep together, by classes, occasional services, or other means, those who have recently been confirmed. The season of confirmation I always found to be the parish priest's best opportunity. Hearts are then tender, minds have been recently exercised upon subjects of sacred interest, and if only the good intentions of that time can be developed into fixed and steady purpose, I believe that hundreds of souls now suffered to drift away into worldliness, might be secured for Christ and for heaven. I have suggested what I think to be best in regard to the elder scholars. It would seem, however to be very desirable in town parishes where effective lay-assistance is procurable, and where church accommodation is scanty, to endeavour to organise special services for the younger of the Sunday-school children. In my last London parish there was a service of this kind every Sunday morning. It offers special advantages. The service can be shorter, and it can be brightened with hymns specially suitable for children, and sung at shorter intervals than would be desirable in the ordinary service. The addresses, to, might be specially adapted to the wants and capacity of the young hearers, might be largely interspersed with appropriate anecdotes, and above all be made short and telling. Should the clergyman, perhaps, feel that in this way he was shut out from the opportunity of giving Sunday instruction to the younger members of his flock, he can easily remedy this, by catechising the children in church once a month at an afternoon service. I believe that he would thus give them more effective instruction than by taking them to church every Sunday to listen to sermons wholly unsuitable to their age and capacity. Laymen would of course naturally take the ordinary children's services. And I must say that the circumstances of the present day seem to call, in general, for a considerable extension of the prophetic office in the church. A Bishop of Manchester observed, in his sermon before the Church Congress at Newcastle, "Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors, Teachers—these are the needs of the church to-day. Priests, possibly, for quiet ordinary times, but prophets for crises. And if anyone cannot see that the church is passing through a crisis now—fiercer, sharper, more intense than any which has tried her for generations—he cannot read the most obvious signs of this time. But now whence are we to obtain any great access of prophetic power to deal with that great crisis which is upon us? Partly, I cannot doubt, from an extension of lay preaching. In order to prevent misunderstanding, I beg you to observe that in what follows I refer to the work of lay preachers who shall not receive any regular stipend, who shall not leave their ordinary secular calling, and who, although appointed to a distinct position in the church, may at any time retire from it. There can be little doubt, I think, that the prophetic ministry was more frequently exercised by laymen in the early church than it has been in later days. Most of you are perhaps aware that Origen, a layman, was invited by two Bishops to preach at Cæsarea, and that although what was done was objected to by Demetrius of Alexandria, it was not on the ground that a layman could not preach, but only because he should not have been asked to do so in the presence of Bishops. Even this was not granted by the two inculpated prelates, who affirm in answering the charge, that "wheresoever there are found those qualified to benefit the brethren, these are exhorted by the holy Bishops to address the people." This testimony is confirmed by the apostolical constitutions, which enact (viii., 32), "Let him that teaches, although he be one of the laity, yet if he be skilful in the word and grave in his manners, teach, for they shall all be taught of God." Such was the custom early in the third century. Subsequently this liberty of prophesying was somewhat restricted, but still, as late as the 5th century, we find among the canons of the fourth council of Carthage, canons subscribed by St. Augustine, the following:—"Laicus præsentibus clericis, nisi ipsis jubentibus, docere non audeat." We may clearly infer from this, that the laity might teach when the clergy were absent; and, with their consent, even when they were present. It is perhaps worthy of notice also, that the same council admit by implication that women might teach, not members of their own sex only, but men also, so long as they did not teach in the public assemblies. The words are "*Mulier, quamvis docta et sancta, viros in conventa docere non præsumat.*" Such teaching as that of Miss Marsh, and, indeed, of most of our female evangelists, would fall within the lines which are marked as permitted by this canon. The only authoritative utterance of our own church on the subject of lay preaching is to be found in the 23rd article. These two points are to be noted. We observe, first, that the prohibition of the article extends only to

ministering in the congregation; that is, in the parish church. To this prohibition, the Puritans objected at the Hampton-court Conference that it was not rigid enough, implying, as it plainly did, the lawfulness or lay ministrations and preaching when it was not in the congregation. We notice in the second place, that even in the congregation the prohibition extends only to those who are not "chosen and called to the work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard." Thus it is clear that any Bishop may, if he pleases as Bishop Perry did, give authority to laymen to preach in the congregation in the absence of the parish clergyman. Hitherto that authority has been given only in the form of a license, probably because no service has been provided by the church for the setting apart of such lay ministers. This would seem, however, to have been rather by oversight than by intention, for the Act 3, Edward VI., provides that "the ordination services to be drawn up by six prelates and six other men of this realm, shall include Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and other ministers of the church." Having regard, I suppose, to this intention, definite steps have been taken by some Bishops in England towards supplying this want. In 1865 the Lower House of Convocation passed the following resolution:—"That this house, recognising the importance of encouraging lay agency, is of opinion that the spiritual wants of the church would be most effectually met by the constitution of a distinct office such as that of sub-deacon or reader, as auxiliary to the sacred ministry of the church." In the following year (1866) the Bishops of both provinces, at a meeting held under the Presidency of Archbishop Langley on Ascension Day, "passed a series of most important resolutions, sanctioning and encouraging the employment of duly appointed lay-readers." I do not possess a copy of those resolutions, but upon the question of commission and formal setting apart, I find that last year Archbishop Tait recommended, in accordance with the resolutions of 1866, "that when suitable men have come forward and been approved, they should receive, as in London, a formal commission from the Bishop, with such religious service as may deepen in their minds a sense of the responsibility of the position on which they are entering, and may be the instrument of calling down God's blessing on their labours." Such a commission exists in the diocese of London, and one has recently been issued in the diocese of Durham. You will observe that in the passage quoted above, the Archbishop uses the words "when a man has been approved." He explains his meaning in a subsequent part of the same letter thus—"There seems to be nothing to prevent each Bishop from requiring a test of fitness, and arranging for those who can avail themselves of it some suitable course of instruction, by which busy men may be assisted in preparation for such work without an undue interference with the claims of their ordinary secular callings." Courses of instruction have already been provided for such lay candidates both at St. Paul's Cathedral, London, and at Keble College, Oxford. I am sure that amongst the canons of our own Cathedral there are those who would be as willing as they are able to deliver courses of lectures to candidates for the lay commission on such subjects as the following:—"Biblical Exposition," "Dogmatic Theology," "Homiletics and Pastoral Theology." Such lectures would not necessarily require in the student the knowledge of any language but English, and would be followed by an examination. I do not think that the time is ripe for the consideration of a change in the designation of such lay ministers. The title of sub-deacon has been proposed, but to this there are several objections. The ancient sub-deacons were rather vergers and sacristans than teachers, and their orders were indelible. The title "reader" has been appropriated in this diocese to laymen, who having left their ordinary calling, receive a stipend, and practically perform the office of pastor as well as teacher in their several charges. I incline myself to the apostolical title, "Teacher." This word would exactly describe the function to be performed on its prophetic side, and would mark the fact that it did not include the pastoral office. Such a title would no more exclude the reading of the service than does the title "reader" the preaching of sermons. This question, however, must be dealt with, I think, by the General Synod. It is enough for the present to use the title "Honorary Reader." And after all, it is not so much the name, as the thing, which is of highest importance. We must all recognise the fact that the number is increasing of pious laymen, whose general education is at least equal to that of the clergy, who are often good and practised speakers, and who are admirably qualified by their zeal and ability to supplement the work of the clergy in preaching the gospel. The church needs their help, and I now give notice that I shall be ready to set apart to their office with a solemn service, and to issue an appropriate commission to all honorary readers who, being nominated by a clergyman, shall pass the elementary examination to which I have before referred. I will here barely mention, what nevertheless I deeply feel, that we have done scarcely anything yet in this diocese to organise the spiritual work of women. I was delighted to assist recently at the inauguration of the Girls' Friendly Society, and I would earnestly commend its work to the support of my brethren the clergy. It has had a wonderful success in England, and only needs loving and prayerful attention to attain a similar measure of influence among ourselves. At the same time I think we need something more than societies for the help of the friendless. We need some organisation for workers, especially for such as feel a disposition to consecrate their whole time to Christian labours. A deaconess institution, which should secure to ladies who feel that they have a vocation for spiritual work, shelter, companionship, and direction, could, I believe, secure to us valuable help which is now lost. In such institutions much might be done to deepen and develop that power of direct, simple,

religious appeal which is peculiar to women, and has given to some of them such wonderful influence as teachers. There can be no doubt, however, that for the exercise of her prophetic function the church must depend principally upon the preaching of her clergy. And, my reverend brethren, how should the knowledge of this fact quicken our desires and our efforts to meet that terrible crisis of which the Bishop of Manchester has warned us by the best energy of our heart and intellect. During the past year a rather remarkable criticism of modern preaching was published by one who wishes us well—I Professor Mahaffy. We may learn much, no doubt, from so thoughtful a book, but its chief effect upon me, I confess, was to reveal the great difficulty of the question, even on its intellectual side. The preacher, we are told, should have abundant intellectual culture to give variety to his thoughts, and yet should be careful not to launch out into critical or scientific topics in his sermons. He should not be too logical, and he should not be too emotional. He should be strongly and healthily dogmatic, and yet he should avoid dogmatism on points where public opinion will not sustain him, as on such subjects as eternal punishment and divine decrees. He is to study variety of matter and form, and yet is to avoid all excess of variety. "If he employs anecdotes, and descends to particulars in order to give colour to his sermons, he is thought familiar; if he keeps to dogma only, he is thought too dry." "Nothing," we are told, "displeases our people more than having their traditional religion questioned." There is a powerful society, we are reminded, which cares not to be disturbed, which hates to be alarmed, and which desires little more from the pulpit than a confirmation of its prejudices. And yet, on the other hand, it is not to be forgotten that "no man will be great as a teacher who is felt to be avoiding the burning topics of the day," or who, "keeping within the bounds set him by the theological public, takes no lead in the march of opinion." Nothing is more certain than that "the so-called safe men in a church are among the surest causes of its decay." One rises from the perusal of such a criticism with an almost comic sense of the hopelessness of getting any practical direction from it. One thing only is very clear, that if the critic changed places with the preacher, and gave no more certain sound than his book gives, he would soon be left to preach to empty benches. It can be surely matter of little astonishment to find that the book ends with a recommendation that preaching should be a luxury seldom indulged in, and then principally by men of special aptitude, who by constant itineration can safely preach over and over again the few good sermons which are alone worth delivering. I do not wish to find fault with much that is excellently said in this essay, and I think that we all may get valuable hints from it. At the same time I venture to say that it will be a bad day for the Christian church when the majority of her ministers give up preaching the everlasting gospel. It may be well "to have an authoritative selection of the very best sermons for the use of those who have little talent and less time for this sort of effort. But I am sure that the use of such sermons should be the exception and not the rule, unless indeed the minister is to sink into a mere machine, and to lose touch of the spiritual life of his people. No doubt it is very desirable that we should all seek to improve our sermons. And if I were asked what I think to be principally lacking in them, I should say painstaking. What we all need is more soul-travail, more prayer to God for the patience and industry, which by large reading and close examination of God's word and the heart of man, can climb at last to so lofty a point of view—so towering a Darien-peak—that we can catch the vision of broad oceans of truth, and feel the quickening breath of new islands of hope, not too far off in the distance. It is only the delight of such visions of truth which can quicken within us the longing to tell others what we have found, and can wing our words with something like life and eloquence. You cannot manufacture true eloquence. Rhetoric, with a bright glitter in it which shall dazzle thoughtless eyes, you may manufacture. But it will be good for nothing if it cover only dry secularity or vacant platitudes. It will stir no one, shame no one, open no hearts, alter no lives. Truth with life in it, truth seen and grasped and loved as something above one as a light from the Eternal, destined to throw its healing beams into the darkness of lost lives; that is the only thing which can inspire true eloquence. Again, suffer me to remind you, my reverend brethren, that if we would make our sermons effective, we must take as much pains in the expression of truth as in the pursuit thereof. Give me something to say, cries the fluent man, and I want no more. Yes you do!—you want self-control enough to set limits to your fluency, which, if it be suffered to run over, will so dilute the truth with mere flux of words as to rob it of all smiting force. We must try to preserve to the thought all its native keenness of edge; for it is only by hurling it thus against the woolly indifference of the worldly mind that you can cut a way for it through this all but impenetrable medium. Long talking is not a praise but a reproach to a man, unless the subject of his thoughts be such that with all his efforts he cannot get his thoughts said adequately in fewer words. Yes, infinite painstaking; mental toil that shall tire us worse than a manual labourer ever could be tired, that is what we need. Is any of us thinking perhaps of throwing away his manuscript? That is a perilous thing for a young man to do, unless indeed he be sent to minister to very ignorant people. But if you will throw away your manuscript, then prepare for intenser toil than when you had it. For unless you would fail, you must be just as accurate, just as concise, just as careful to put nothing but fresh natural colouring into your metaphors, as when you had your book. I have dwelt on this matter at length because there are so many mistakes about it. Some men, who ought to know better, refuse to reveal all the pains they take in order to get the empty praise of superior powers, as if their painstaking were not infinitely more to their credit than powers

of any sort could be. Others, again, talk about trusting to the guidance of the Spirit, as if the Spirit could ever guide a man into idleness or into neglect of the uttermost improvement of both thought and vehicle of which he was capable. If some of those people who talk about trusting to the Spirit could only hear themselves; could only realise the feebleness, confusion, and insupportable tediousness which make up the result, they would scarcely be impious enough to attribute such causes to the Spirit of God. If, my brethren, when we have done our best and uttermost, we consciously fail, as alas! too often we do, then it may well be that there was lacking to us that hearty prayer to God, to lift up our spirit into enthusiastic love of souls, and desire to glorify our Redeemer, which can alone give the tongue of fire to the most careful preparation. Within the last year a new movement has been set on foot to secure Bible reading in state schools. It is entirely a layman's movement. It began in South Australia, and has there obtained a wonderful success. Gradually it spread across our western border to Warrnambool and Geelong; and the other day some members of the committees of those western towns called together the ministers of Protestant denominations in Melbourne, to listen to several proposals. It seems not unlikely that this agitation among our pious laity may spread. It is very little that I can say about this new league at present. But in view of possible discussions I desire to set down here some conclusions which have been already established, and some principles which are, I believe, as certain as death. First, it has been proved that at least 100,000 children in Victoria never enter a Sunday-school. It follows, from the mere fact, that these are amongst the worst or the worst-guided of our children. Those who keep away from our Sunday-schools need them most. Secondly, it has been shown to be impossible for the ministers of religion to undertake the task of religious teaching in state schools. Taken together, they number 703, while the number of instructors in public schools is 4 130. Of the 703 ministers, 172 are stationed in Melbourne and the suburbs, leaving the rest to do the hard, incessant work of the country districts, How can this small body of men, overworked already, add to their labour the tuition in sacred knowledge of children who require more than 4000 teachers? Thirdly, if the clergy could do the work, the conditions imposed by our act would insure failure. It requires a compulsory law to get our children into the day schools. And you ask us to induce children to remain voluntarily to be taught religion when they have been tired by the labours of the day. As things are, it would no doubt make little difference if even we were permitted to teach before school, but to require us to teach after school, is to make a demand which is simply ridiculous. At a recent meeting of the Public Teachers' Association at Adelaide, "the president stated that he had given notice three times in the West Adelaide school to the effect that the would read the Bible half an hour before school hours, but not a single child attended. He had also tried the experiment in the evening with the same result." Seldom, indeed, has such an effort proved even moderately successful, and it is absurd to put it gravely forward as a practicable measure. What is to be done, then, you will ask? Well, my friends, I will say at once that I believe we shall never have peace, either in the political world or in our own consciences, until some kind of elementary religious instruction is given in the state school by the teacher. I say this because I believe that it is impossible here should be any effective morality which is not based upon religion. I would ask any sober Theist who may doubt this to read and carefully study Professor Seeley's remarkable work on *Natural Religion*. The book takes as its motto Wordsworth's words, "We live by admiration," and it shows that nothing good ever was done, or can be done, in poetry, in art, or in ethics, except by men who fix their eyes on something greater, nobler, and more beautiful than themselves. Try to make an artist by teaching him the rules of art. A pedant you may make in that way, but an artist, never. If he is to get the tenderness, the life, and the inspiration which appeal to human souls, which touch them, sweeten them, ennoble them, he must have his own spirit kindled and uplifted by a beauty, grandeur, a solemnity in nature which he feels to be infinitely admirable, and infinitely beyond and above him. It is so in morals. Try to form a good or great character by teaching rules of morality. You may create a Pharisee or a Philistine by that method—a man "who is pure, as the dead dry sand is pure"—but a large, noble, affluent, influential soul, never. Men can only be lifted into higher moods and motives by intensest worship of what is seen to be infinitely good, and infinitely beyond and above them—in a word, by religion. The enlightened Theist must be just as certain of this as the most devoted Christian. To try to form character or improve conduct (the great end of life) without religion, is the wildcat and stupidest dream which ever misled the fanatic or the visionary. There are some things in education of which I am doubtful. Of this I am as certain as I am of my own existence. Miss Francis Power Cobbe is at least no bigot, and what does she say of the future of a life without God? "I honestly think," she observes, "that the process of making atheists, trained as such into philanthropists, will be but rarely achieved. And I venture to propound the question to those who point to admirable living examples of Atheistic or Comtist philanthropy, how many of these have passed through the earlier stage of morality as believers in God, and with all the aid which prayer and faith and hope could give them? That they remain actively benevolent, having advanced so far, is (as I have shown) to be anticipated. But will their children stand where they stand now? We are yet obeying the great impetus of religion, and running along the rails laid down by our forefathers. Shall we continue in the same course when that impetus has stopped, and we have left the rails altogether? I fear me not. In brief, I think the outlook of atheism, as a moral

educator, as black as need be." "If," says Professor Naville, "there is a man on earth who ought to fall on both knees and shed burning tears of gratitude, it is the man who believes himself an atheist, and who has received from Providence so keen a taste for what is noble and pure, and so strong an aversion for evil, that his sense of duty remains firm even when it has lost all its supports." Now secularism is practical atheism. The man who never thinks of God lives really without Him. And what, then, is likely to be the future of those 100,000 children, nearly the half of our children of school age, who never hear about God at all? We know what their homes are. The mere fact of their absence from Sunday-school tells us this. You know what are the special temptations of youth, and you know, I suppose, that some of the most attractive and sensational literature of the day is little else than a Satanic irritation of the strongest and most destructive passions of our nature. Well, then, here is a child, who has never been taught to think of any obligations to God, turned loose in the midst of this literature to choose for himself. Tell me, as an honest man, whether you think the power to read under these circumstances a blessing or a curse. For my part, I say at once, that to call our present reading, writing, and arithmetic business an education is nothing better than a cruel jest. So strongly do I feel this, that at times when I see the fresh young creatures swarming out of the doors of our schools, a dull heavy pain settles over my heart which I can hardly master. I want to help them, and I cannot. I see them launched upon the down-hill road to selfishness and misery, and I cannot stop them. So far as words are concerned I have done my best for them, and done it vainly. I cannot persuade their parents that they are passing them through the fire to the Moloch of immorality, and I can only pray that laymen who see clearly what I see may be more successful. Do you believe these things, my friends? If you do, the question is as good as settled, for then you will meet others with the determination to arrive at an agreement, and to get religious morality taught in some form in our state schools. If, however, you do not believe what I have said—if you think that to teach our children to read and form letters is education, and that you can make men moral by telling them to be so, or by leaving them to the chance influences of life—then it is useless to attempt anything, for excuses are as plentiful as blackberries, and difficulties bristle round us at every step. In that case, things must be left to go on yet longer in the old bad way. More children must be sent into the world without a glimmering of religious principles, more bitter conflicts must be waged between politicians and churches, until at length, in the midst of a swelling tide of evils, men may be scared into trying to raise religious embankments when perhaps it is too late. Beware, however, I would say to politicians, how you arouse and exasperate conscience. It can shatter your parties as if they were egg-shells, and sweep aside your poor bickerings about "the meal-tub" (as Carlyle calls it), as if they were the disputes of children. For "the meal-tub" is a poor thing at the best, and so long as man the immortal dreams dreams of the infinite, of that which, under any name is more real to him than his own soul, you can never force him to give up his eternal birthright for a mess of pottage. Shame on him, death to him if you could—for the only sure foundation of order and happiness, in these days of royal assassination, reckless suicide, and cynical materialism, is to be found in that brotherhood of Christ which rests on the fatherhood of God.

Outrages Upon the Jews in Russia. Report of the Public Meeting at the Mansion House, On Wednesday, February 1st, 1882. With an Appendix, Containing Lists of Towns Where Similar Meetings Were held, Together with a Letter Addressed to the Chief Rabbi, by the Graduates of Oxford University. *Published by Direction of the COUNCIL OF THE ANGLO-JEWISH ASSOCIATION.* Offices of the Anglo-Jewish Association: 160, Portsdown Road, London, W.

Persecution of the Jews in Russia.

On Wednesday afternoon, February the 1st, a meeting convened by the Lord Mayor, in response to the subjoined requisition, was held in the Egyptian Hall, Mansion House, "to express public opinion upon the outrages inflicted upon the Jews in various parts of Russia and Russian Poland." The chair was taken by the Lord Mayor, at three o'clock. The requisition was then read, and was as follows:—

*TO THE RIGHT HON. THE LORD MAYOR OF THE CITY OF LONDON.
MY LORD,—*

We the undersigned consider that there should be a public expression of opinion respecting the persecutions to which the Jews in various parts of the Russian empire have for a long time past been subjected. We therefore ask your Lordship to be so good as to call, at your earliest convenience, a public meeting for that purpose, at the Mansion House, and that you will be good enough to take the chair on the occasion.

We remain, my Lord,

Faithfully yours

This document was signed by the following eminent persons:—

- His Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.
- The Right Hon. the Earl of Shaftesbury, K.G.
- The Right Hon. Lord Scarsdale.
- The Right Rev. The Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.
- The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Oxford.
- Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, M.P.
- The Hon. W. St. John Brodrick, M.P.
- Sir Arthur Otway, Bart., M.P.
- Alderman Sir James Clark Lawrence, Bart, M. P.
- Sir Erasmus Wilson, F.R.S.
- The Rev. the Master of Balliol.
- The Rev. Canon Spence, M.A.
- The Rev. H. R. Haweis, M.A.
- Charles Darwin, Esq., F.R.S.
- Matthew Arnold, Esq., E.R.S.
- Henry Richard, Esq., M.P.
- Charles Magniac, Esq., M.P.
- Mr. Alderman Lawrence, M.P.
- F. A. Inderwick, Esq., Q.C., M.P.
- His Eminence Cardinal Manning.
- The Right Hon. and Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of London.
- The Right Hon. Lord Mount-Temple.
- The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Manchester.
- The Right Hon. Lord Elcho, M.P.
- The Hon. F. Leveson-Gower, M.P.
- The Right Hon. J. G. Hubbard, M.P.
- Sir John Lubbock, Bart., M.P., F.R.S.
- Sir Donald Currie, K.C.M.G., M.P.
- The Very Rev. the Dean of Peterborough, D.D.
- The Rev. Canon Farrar, D.D.
- The Rev. W. Page Roberts, M.A.
- The Rev. James Martineau, D. D.
- Professor Tyndall, F.R.S.
- Samuel Morley, Esq., M.P.
- Michael Biddulph, Esq., M.P.
- Mr. Alderman Cotton, M.P.
- Alexander McArthur, Esq., M.P.
- C. A. McLaren, Esq., M.P.

THE LORD MAYOR on taking his seat on the platform was greeted with loud cheers. Among those present were the Earl of Shaftesbury, the Bishop of London, the Bishop of Oxford, Cardinal Manning, Lord Reay, Lord Arthur Russell, M.P., Sir Nathaniel de Rothschild, M.P., Mr. Serjeant Simon. M.P., Mr. Alfred de Rothschild, Baron Ferdinand de Rothschild, Lord Haldon. Lord Stanley of Alderley, Lord Elcho, M.P., Sir Arthur Otway, M.P., Sir Albert Sassoon, Alderman Sir Robert W. Carden, M.P., Mr. C. M'Claren, M.P., the Rev. Canon Farrar, Alderman Sir Francis Truscott, Mr. A. M'Arthur, M.P., Mr. Alderman Lawrence, M.P., Alderman Sir J. C. Lawrence, M.P., Alderman Sir Thomas White, the Hon. E. Lyulph Stanley, M.P., Sir Julian Goldsmid, Admiral Sir Geoffrey Hornby, Professor Bryce, M.P., the Right Hon. J. G. Hubbard, M.P., Mr. Alderman Fowler, M.P., the Mayor of Folkestone (Mr. Coules), Mr. Robert Browning, the Rev. Canon Spence, Mr. Arthur Cohen, Q.C, M.P., Mr. Edward Clarke, Q.C, M.P., Mr. Alderman Cotton, M.P., Mr. Shield, Q.C, M.P., Mr. Thomson Hankey, the Right Rev. . Monsignor Capel, Sir George Bowyer, Mr. William Fowler, M.P., Sir Albert Galt, Sir Julius Vogel, the Hon. Saul Samuel, C.M.G. (Agent-General for New South Wales), the Rev. Newman Hall, Mr. Montague Guest, M.P., the Dean of Wells, the Dean of Peterborough, Mr. Marriott, Q.C, M.P., Mr. E. Howley Palmer, Mr. Francis Buxton, M.P., Mr. Oswald John Simon, the Rev. Prebendary Cadman, the Rev. J. H. Coward, the Rev. Dr. Hermann Adler, the Rev. Harvey Brooks, Sir John Bennett, Baron George de Worms, the Rev. H. R. Haweis, the Hon. Moritz Ellinger, of New York, Mr. Alderman Breffit, the Rev. E. H. Bickersteth, Major Snell, Dean Bagot, the Rev. C. Voysey, Mr. J. W. Probyn, the Rev. H. Lansdell,

Mr. Samuel Montagu, Mr. Burne-Jones, the Rev. Dr. Martineau, Professor Thorold Rogers, M.P., Mr. Magniac, M.P., Mr. Henry Brinsley Sheridan, M.P., Mr. Israel Davis, Mr. Sidney Woolf, M.P., Dr. Gladstone, Mr. Lionel L. Cohen, Dr. Congreve, the Rev. Canon Jenkyns, Sir William Rose Robinson, Archdeacon Brooks, Mr. Daniel Grant, M.P., the Hon. Rollo Russell, the Rev. A. L. Green, Mr. Sedley Taylor, Mr. P. Callan, M.P., Mr. Cyril Flower, M.P., Mr. George Ellis, M. Léon Jolivard, Ven. Archdeacon Blunt, Sir George F. Bowen (Governor of Victoria), Sir Thomas Bateson, M.P., Mr. Loftus Tottenham, M.P., Rev. Horrocks Cocks, Rev. J. Wilkinson, Mr. Israel Hart (High Bailiff of Leicester), Alderman Emanuel (of Southsea), Dr. A. Asher, Mr. I. Seligman, Mr. Leopold Schloss, Mr. H. L. Beddington, Mr. E. M. Leon, Mr. J. B. Montefiore, and Mr. W. J. Soulsby. Among the ladies present were the Lady Mayoress and Miss Ellis, the Baroness Burdett-Coutts, Dowager Lady Stanley of Alderley, Viscountess Strangford, Lady Wynford, and the Hon. Miss Mostyn, Lady de Rothschild, the Dowager Lady (Anthony) de Rothschild, Louisa Lady Goldsmid, Mrs. George Lewis, Mrs. Henry Lucas, Lady and Miss Henderson, Mrs. and the Misses Simon, the Countess d'Avigdor, Mrs. Arthur Cohen, and Mrs. Jacob Waley.

THE LORD MAYOR, who on rising was received with cordial cheers spoke as follows:—My Lords, Ladies, and Gentlemen,—In compliance with the memorial which has been presented to me, and which has been signed by most influential men,—men whose names are foremost in this country for their philanthropy, for their political knowledge, and for their political courage, but no less also for their unswerving determination to advance the interests of humanity as well as those of their own country,—I have convened this meeting. (Cheers.) If this memorial had been presented to me by any one section of society I need hardly say that, placed as I am in the responsible position which I occupy, I should hardly have dared to have filled this hall with such an audience as I have here present. But if you look at the memorial, with the roll of names attached to it you will see that every creed of religion is represented—that the great Christian world, severed and divided as it is, has combined in this memorial in requesting me to call this meeting. If, again, you take the political creeds of this country, you will find that men of all parties, whatever may be their views upon political matters, have combined in the same request. I feel, therefore, that I shall have the sympathy, not only of those who are present, but that the whole country is with us on this platform, and with those gentlemen whom I shall have the honour, presently, to call upon to propose some resolutions (Cheers.) I should, perhaps, be wanting in my duty if I did not add that the sympathy of the women of England has also been evoked on this great occasion, and that a lady whose name stands above all others for works of philanthropy, for works of charity, for works of benevolence, and especially for works calculated to advance the interests, the material prosperity, the domestic comfort, and the religious instruction of the poorer classes of society, is on the platform by my side, anxious to aid in, and show her sympathy with, another work of charity, which I believe will add lustre even to the name of the Baroness Burdett-Coutts, (Great cheering.) I need not detain you with any further observations, nor will I do so, as there are several gentlemen here, who will, I have no doubt, address you in most eloquent strains. But I have been asked by the Committee, and the gentlemen associated with me in the arrangements for this meeting, to read some letters which I have received, because they come from men of such high position, and of such varied opinions, that it is desirable that in their unavoidable absence their sentiments should be made known to you in that way. The first letter which I have to read is from the ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY. (Loud cheers.) It is as follows:—

"My Dear Lord,—It is a distress to me that I am forbidden by my medical attendant to take part in the meeting your lordship has undertaken to call together to enter an emphatic protest against the recent outrages to which the Jewish people have been exposed. Unable to attend myself, I have asked Canon Farrar to be present (cheers), and express the horror with which I contemplate the disgrace brought on the Christian name by these shameful persecutions."

The DUKE OF WESTMINSTER writes:—

"I am unable to attend the meeting to-morrow. I cannot, however, repress my feeling of horror and of indignation at the barbarities and ruin worked upon the defenceless Jews in Russia. I am afraid there can be no doubt as to an enormous amount of great and hideous wrong-doing, but we want more information, to obtain which every effort should be made, and for acquiring which I believe the Russian Government are willing to give facilities? Meanwhile, I can well understand and can sympathise with the feeling that prompts thousands of our fellow-countrymen to give vent to their indignation against the perpetrators of these barbarities, and of sympathy with those who have suffered and are suffering under these enormities."

The BISHOP OF EXETER, after expressing regret at being unable to attend, writes:—

"I should have greatly desired to join my voice to those that will be uplifted in protest against such cruelties. No language can well be thought too strong to declare our abhorrence of such conduct and our appeal to the Russian authorities to use every effort to punish it and prevent its repetition."

The BISHOP OF MANCHESTER writes:—

"As I signed the requisition to the Lord Mayor begging him to call a public meeting at the Mansion House,

at which an opportunity might be given for the expression of the feeling that, I imagine, is strong in the hearts of all Englishmen with regard to the outrages to which the Jews appear to have been subjected in Russia, I regret that it is out of my power to attend that meeting in person; but the Mayor has called a similar meeting in Manchester for February 3rd, at which I hope to be present, and where I shall have an opportunity of saying what I feel. I will merely say now that those outrages, as they have been reported in England, have aroused in my breast the liveliest feelings of pity and indignation. I cannot for a moment believe that any civilised Government could either encourage or connive at them, and it seems to me that the Government of Russia owes it to the place it occupies in Christian Europe to extend the strong arm of its protection to the weak and helpless, and to repress with all the force at its command acts of pillage and violence which one would have thought were only possible in some bygone age of barbarism."

The BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL writes:—

"I particularly regret that diocesan business of importance prevents me attending and raising my poor voice against the horrors and barbarities that have taken place. Pray express publicly, if you think fit, my deep regret that I am prevented attending the meeting, and that thus lose this opportunity of joining with others in expressing abhorrence at the atrocities perpetrated in a Christian country against God's ancient people, the Jews."

Mr. ALFRED TENNYSON, the Poet Laureate, writes:—

"I am unable to be present at the Mansion House on February 1st. Not the less am I dismayed by the reports of this madness of hatred against the Jews, whatever the possible provocation, and of the unspeakable barbarities consequent. If they are not universally denounced, it can only be that they are so alien to the spirit of the age as to be almost unbelievable. The stronger the national protest the better. Our Government, however, may have reason to fear that it may do more harm than good by official intervention."

The MASTER OF BALLIOL writes:—

"The cruelties which have been inflicted on the Jews in Russia, as narrated by the correspondent of the Times, are detestable, and should be denounced by the unanimous opinion of civilised nations."

LOUD KINNAIRD writes:—

"Feeling deeply how scandalous are the outrages inflicted upon the Jews in Russia, and I may add elsewhere, I should have wished by my presence at your meeting to manifest my sympathy and to testify my abhorrence of the wrongs to which they have been subjected."

The DEAN OF RIPON writes:—

"I hope the meeting will be very largely attended, and that the protest against the cruel and cowardly persecution of the Jews in Russia will be strong enough to check the continuance of barbarities which are a disgrace to the Christian name. I hope that every Mayor in England will follow your good example in convening a public meeting on the subject."

Then I have a letter written by the daughter of SIR BENJAMIN PHILLIPS, at his request. She says:—

"My father wishes me to express his thanks to you for the trouble you are taking in a matter which so deeply affects him personally, and at a moment when the whole world is ringing with the cruelties and outrages inflicted upon a long-suffering and innocent people. At the same time he feels proud as a fellow-citizen, and as one of the oldest members of the Corporation, that the voice of the Lord Mayor of London should have been raised against intolerance and injustice."

BARON HENRY DE WORMS writes:—

"I regret extremely that it will not be possible for me to be present at the meeting at the Mansion House on the 1st of February, as I have a political engagement at Manchester for that day. Could you oblige me by notifying this at the meeting, as in my capacity of President of the Anglo-Jewish Association, and as one taking the deepest interest in the movement, I should not like my absence to be mis-understood."

Mr. H. H. FOWLER, M.P. for Wolverhampton, writes:—

"It is the duty of Englishmen, irrespective of creed or party, to utter their strongest protest against this brutal and barbarous persecution. If the Russian Government have sanctioned, connived at, or condoned these fiendish cruelties, no considerations of a political or dynastic character should be allowed to stifle the voice of England."

Mr. F. D. MOCATTA writes:—

"I am very grieved not to be able to attend the meeting at the Mansion House next Wednesday, by reason of my absence from England. The recent events in Russia are so sad, and so great a blot on our civilisation and our age, that it becomes a first duty of all feeling men and women to lift up their voice in condemnation of them, and in sympathy with the victims. It is to be hoped that the noble conduct of your Lordship will be imitated in other cities and in other countries, and that those in authority in Russia will be led to see how wicked a tiling it is to allow the persecution of persons belonging to any race, or professing any creed, and how dangerous a policy it is to all the other portions of society. I trust that at the great meeting your lordship is now holding, all

persons will feel impressed with the seriousness of the humanitarian cause which has brought them together, and that none will pervert this demonstration of brotherly love into becoming an arena of party strife, nor of political or sectarian contention. Hoping that as much good will result from this meeting as I believe likely to spring from it, I am, &c."

The following is a letter from the Venerable Dr. Adler (Chief Rabbi):—

"My dear Lord Mayor,—I regret more deeply than I can express that the state of my health renders it impossible for me to be present at the public meeting to be held at the Mansion House to-morrow, under your lordship's able presidency. I need hardly assure your lordship how keen is the grief which I share with every member of my community at the pitiable calamities suffered by my co-religionists in Russia. But in the midst of the darkness which overshadows my oppressed brethren, there is happily a gleam of light. For there appears to me no small probability that deliverance may arise through the influence of the public opinion of free and enlightened England, and through the noble and spontaneous outburst of sympathy from our Christian fellow-countrymen. Grateful, indeed, do I feel, in common with every Israelite in this land, for the enthusiastic and practical sympathy which has thus found utterance; and the grief which oppresses my heart at the dire woes of my brethren is not a little assuaged by the consoling thought that I have lived to witness in the people of England the noblest development of religious toleration—the union of all creeds on the broad platform of common humanity. May God, our common Father, bless your philanthropic efforts, and crown them with success.—Believe me, my dear Lord Mayor, yours very faithfully, N. ADLER, Dr."

LORD ROSEBEKY writes:—

"I have to express my deep regret that absence in Scotland on public business prevents my attending the meeting at the Mansion House, to-morrow."

Well, then, gentlemen, in the last place I have to read a very characteristic letter from the REV. MR. SPURGEON. (Cheers.) He says:—

"I am sorry that I am quite precluded by prior engagements from being at the Mansion House to speak against the outrages committed upon the Jews. I am, however, relieved by the belief that the heart of England is one in a strong feeling of indignation at the inhuman conduct of certain savages in Russia. Every man and woman among us feels eloquently on behalf of our fellow-men who are subjected to plunder and death, and still more for our sisters, to whom even worse treatment has been meted out. Hence you have the less need of speeches and orations. As a Christian, I feel that the name of our Redeemer is dishonoured by such conduct on the part of his professed followers. As a Nonconformist and a Liberal, believing in the equal rights of all men to live in freedom and safety, I must protest against a state of things in which the Jew is made an outlaw. Lastly, as a man, I would mourn in my inmost soul that any beings in human form should be capable of crimes such as those which have made Russia red with Israelitish blood. But what need even of these few sentences? The oppressed are sure of advocates wherever Englishmen assemble."

The reading of the foregoing letters was frequently interrupted by cheers. Similar letters had, it appeared, been received from the Bishop of Oxford (who was on the platform), Lord Scarsdale, Lord Mount Temple, Lord E. Fitzmaurice, M.P., the Hon. F. Leveson-Gower, M.P., Sir Arthur Otway, M.P., Sir John Lubbock, M.P., Mr. Henry Richard, M.P., Mr. Samuel Morley, M.P., Sir Charles Trevelyan, Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett, M.P., Mr. George Russell, M.P., Mr. Karl Blind, and others.

The EARL OF SHAFTESBURY, having risen at the request of the Lord Mayor to move the first resolution, after being greeted with loud cheers, spoke as follows:—The Lord Mayor has rightly described the purpose and character of this meeting. It is, perhaps, special and peculiar in its character. There may be, or there may not be, a precedent for such a meeting; but I hold that in these days of what is called the "solidarity of nations," of enlarged responsibilities and greatly-increased force of public opinion, if there is not a precedent it ought to be established on this very day. (Cheers.) I am glad that the people of England have come forward to make a solemn declaration that, in their belief, there are moral as well as material weapons; that the moral weapons in the long run are the more effectual and the more permanent; and that it is our duty to resort to those moral weapons when for the use of the material we have neither the right nor the power. I dare say we shall be asked, "What is the purpose of all your movement? Your document or memorial, if there be one, will be cast aside and thrown into the waste-paper basket." My lord, that may be the fate of any document we present; that will not be the fate of the spirit of that document—(cheers)—that spirit will survive and will work its effect upon the hearts of all who can feel or think upon this or upon any other matter. My lord, I have a very strong feeling—and I believe we all have a very strong feeling—as to the power of any open and constantly-repeated affirmation of a great principle founded upon justice and humanity. It carries with it prodigious weight. Have we not seen in times past, and in the present day the marvellous influence produced by a manifestation of public opinion founded upon such attributes? Even the Sultan of Turkey succumbs to public opinion, and the Shah of Persia yields to it. Napoleon, in the very plenitude of his power, as we have read in recent works, so feared the influence and power of Madame de Stael that he would not allow her to come to Paris, because, he said, if she

came she would injure his reputation, and influence the public opinion of the whole world against him. Was the stern and powerful Emperor Nicholas indifferent to public opinion, and especially the public opinion of England? Far from it. I know, from conversations held with him by one of my most intimate friends, who reported to me what had passed that the Emperor Nicholas felt deeply and acutely the public opinion of England. And may we not hope and believe that the humane and enlightened prince who now sits on the throne of all the Russias will feel the influence of the public voice as sent forth from such a meeting as this? I believe that it will be so; I believe that it is far beyond his power to disregard it. I believe we may apply to it the words of old Richard Hooker, who, in writing long ago about the Divine law, said, "The very least feel its care, and the greatest are not exempt from its power." It is not necessary for me to dwell in detail upon the horrible circumstances of the late events in Russia, marked as they have been by murder, lust, rapine, and destruction. They have been set before the world in the columns of the *Times* and of other newspapers. The narratives have been supported by every testimony that could possibly be adduced, and especially by the wise, touching, and unanswerable memorial presented by the Jewish Committee. My lord, we follow the details with horror and disgust, and we are come here for the purpose of expressing our opinion and of praying God that a stop may be put to atrocities which have afflicted and disgraced the generation and the age in which we live. To the statements made, denials have been offered, coming from official authority. Of course it was to be expected that that would be so; but I maintain, after all that I have read and heard, that the evidence in favour of the truth of those statements is so great, so overwhelming, and so powerful as to leave no room for hesitation in accepting them as substantially true. If the Russian authorities say that there has been exaggeration, I will give them the benefit of the doubt; but if one-tenth of all that has been stated be true it is sufficient to draw down the indignation of the world, and to justify the holding of this meeting. (Great cheering.) But, my lord, there are not only denials—there are attempts at refutation in those quasi-official documents which are as truly official as anything that ever came out of the Russian Chancellery. The authors proceed to cast imputations; and what do they say of the movements of the people of England, and what do they say of the gathering here? They say that this movement is one of affected philanthropy; that the object of the promoters is to set English and Russian society by the ears, and that the movement has also the party object of disturbing the peace and happiness of the Cabinet of Mr. Gladstone. (Laughter.) My lord, of all the wild assertions that were ever made this last is the very wildest. Look at the signatures to the requisition. I almost doubt whether you can find the name of a Conservative upon it. Let me just mention one or two names that occur to me. There are the names of Mr. Matthew Arnold and Sir John Lubbock. Are they men whose minds are full of venom and rancour against the Prime Minister? (Laughter.) If this case were not so serious and appalling, I should say that such imputations are childish and contemptible. Those who make them know the fact and feel it; they know very well that this is a free meeting of free citizens, and that we came here to express our deep regard for the rights of the human race. It is not simply because those who are persecuted are Jews that we are met here; Englishmen would, under similar circumstances, feel the same sympathy equally for Buddhists, Mahomedans, or Pagans. (Cheers.) I know that many have a deep and special feeling towards the Hebrew race; I have it myself, I confess, most deeply and most strongly; but we are met here upon one grand universal principle. If there is one thing on earth which an Englishman loves better than another it is freedom—(loud cheers)—and it is the desire of every true Englishman that every one should be as free and as happy as he is himself. (Cheers.) But we must look a little closer into this matter; we must clear the ground of another charge. It is said in one of these quasi-official documents that this movement arises out of hatred of Russia. My lord and gentlemen I do not believe it. (Cheers.) I cannot answer for what may be the feeling of private individuals, but I will boldly take upon myself to say that the feeling of the great mass of the people of England is one neither of hate nor of fear of the Russian people. (Cheers.) Honoured as I have been to-day by having assigned to me the task of moving the first resolution, let me here speak of myself. I cannot be considered a hater of Russia. Let me recall to your recollection that when a meeting was held some years ago for the purpose of protesting against outrages committed on the wretched Bulgarians, I was called upon to occupy the chair, and I then made a statement which I have never retracted, and am not going to retract; I then said "I should not fear to see, nay, I almost wish to see, the Russians upon the shores of the Bosphorus." So far from there being a feeling of hatred towards Russia on the part of the mass of our people, I believe their feeling is precisely the reverse. I will boldly maintain that there is among them nothing in the shape or form of hatred. Further, I am satisfied that there is in the whole of this kingdom at the present moment a feeling of deep sympathy with the people of Russia and with their ruler in the terrible calamity that has fallen upon their country and upon the Imperial family. When the late Emperor fell by the hand of a demoniacal assassin the whole of this country was filled with horror and dismay, which were expressed as with the voice of one man, not only because the people were appalled at such a frightful crime, but because they remembered that the father of the present Emperor—may the son also remember it—was the glorious emancipator of two millions of slaves. (Cheers.) And, after all, if we approach the present Emperor, or in any way appeal to his Imperial Majesty, what are we asking for? Are we asking

anything to lower his dignity or abate his power? Nay, on the contrary, are we not asking him to do that which would conduce very much to his honour? Are we not asking him to do justice to a large body of his loyal and suffering people? Are we not simply asking him to restrain violence, murder, outrage, and spoliation? Are we not asking him to be a Cyrus to the Jews and not an Antiochus Epiphanes? Are we not asking him to enter upon the greatest and noblest exercise of power—to "undo the heavy burdens," and to "let the oppressed go free"? (Loud cheers.) My lord, this is the purpose and object of our meeting; this will be the prayer of our Memorial, and may God in His mercy prosper it to the removal of these horrors and to the comfort of the Jewish people, on whose behalf we are gathered together. His Lordship concluded by moving "That in the opinion of this meeting the persecutions and the outrages which the Jews in many parts of the Russian dominion have for several months past suffered are an offence to civilisation to be deeply deplored."

The BISHOP OF LONDON, who was received with loud and protracted cheers, said—My Lord Mayor and Ladies and Gentlemen: One circumstance and one circumstance alone justifies me in rising, at your Lordship's request, to second this resolution before such a meeting as this, —which I am quite unfitted to address in the presence of those whom I see around me,—and that one circumstance is the unavoidable absence of the Archbishop of Canterbury. I quite admit—indeed I deeply feel—that the Church of England ought not to be, and I am sure she will not be, backward in joining in the expression of a feeling of indignant sorrow at the statements which have come before us lately with regard to the treatment of the Jews in Russia. In the absence, therefore, of the Archbishop it may not be presumptuous in me, the Bishop of the most populous and most important Diocese in England, if I venture, in the absence of any one more fitted for the office, to second the resolution. (Cheers.) Happily, no words from me are needed. The case has been stated to you by the noble Earl with a vigour which shows that age has not diminished his powers of speech, any more than it has extinguished, or ever can extinguish, his sympathy with suffering and his sense of indignation at injustice and crime. (Loud cheers.) The facts can scarcely be denied. If they could have been denied, what need for all those reasons which have been assigned why the English people should not have been so moved at reading of these atrocities? If the Russian Government had been able to say that the statements could be proved to be false, it need not have alleged that the English hate Russia or are afraid of her, and that we desire to turn out the Ministry. We have seen in the newspapers an attempt, hardly to deny the facts, but certainly to palliate them by excuses not only improbable but utterly inadequate, and set before us, I may say, with such a cynical indifference that one would be glad not to be obliged to believe that the words had been traced by the hands of a female. (Cheers.) There is one circumstance, and it is the only one I dwell upon—there's one circumstance connected with these atrocities which must make every member of the Church, indeed every Christian, feel together with his indignation a certain sense of shame. A few years back our country was horrified with accounts of atrocities committed in what were then provinces of the Turkish Empire. The country was moved, but it had the consolation of knowing that though the sufferers were Christians, the perpetrators were almost all of another creed. Now, alas! the case is the reverse. They who have perpetrated these atrocities are men who bear the name of Christians; so that the persecutions of the Middle Ages, on which history has long set the stamp of reprobation, have been reproduced in this latter part of the 19th century, and the dark stain of rapine, lust, and murder is let fall again upon the fair fame of Christianity. (Cheers.) We do feel this; but I will venture to say that not in this crowded room alone, not in this metropolis merely, not in the cities and large towns of England only, are the sympathy and horror felt which have been expressed before you and have called you together to-day, but in the most quiet parsonages and in the most retired villages throughout England there is the same feeling of mingled horror, grief, and shame that now in an age of civilisation, in days when we think ourselves, and in some respects certainly are, better than our fathers, we find a Christian nation persecuting Jews. (Hear, hear.) Knowing this, my Lord Mayor, I venture to assume, speaking here from this platform, that I may without presumption,—or if it be presumption it will be easily pardoned,—in the name of every member of the Church of England second the resolution which Lord Shaftesbury has proposed. (Loud cheers.)

The resolution was then put and carried with acclamation unanimously.

His Eminence CARDINAL MANNING, after a very cordial reception, said—My Lord Mayor, Ladies, and Gentlemen: it has often fallen to my lot to move a resolution in meetings such as this, but never in my memory have I moved one with more perfect conviction of my reason or more entire concurrence of my heart than I shall do on this occasion. Before I use any further words it will, perhaps, be better that I should read that resolution. It is—"That this meeting while disclaiming any right or desire to interfere in the internal affairs of another country, and desiring that the most amicable relations between England and Russia should be preserved, feels it a duty to express its opinion that the laws of Russia relating to Jews tend to degrade them in the eyes of the Christian population, and to expose Russian Jewish subjects to the outbreaks of fanatical ignorance." I need not assert, for I accept the eloquent disclaimer of the noble lord, that we are not met here for a political purpose. If there were a suspicion of any party politics I should not be standing here. It is because I believe that we are high above the tumults and conflicts of party politics, that we are in the serene region of

human sympathy and of human justice, that I am here to-day. I can also declare that nothing can be farther from my intention—as I am confident nothing can be farther from yours—than to do anything which would be a violation of the laws of mutual peace, order, and respect which bind nations together, or to attempt to interfere or to dictate in the domestic legislation of Russia. (Hear, hear.) I am also bound to say that I share heartily in the words of veneration used by the noble Earl towards the Imperial Family of Russia. No man can have watched the last years of the Imperial Family, no man can know the position in which the Emperor stands now, without a profound sympathy which would at once control any disposition on our part to use a single expression which could inflict a wound on the mind of the Czar. (Hear, hear.) Therefore I disclaim absolutely and altogether that anything that passes from my lips—and I believe I can speak for all—is intended to assume a character inconsistent with veneration for a person charged with a responsibility so great as that which has fallen to the lot of the Emperor of Russia. Further, I may say that, while we do not intend to touch upon any question in the internal legislation of Russia, still there are laws larger than any Russian legislation, laws which are equally binding in London, in St. Petersburg, and in Moscow—the laws of humanity, of nature, and of God—which are the foundation of all other laws; and if in any legislation these are violated, all the nations of Christian Europe, the whole commonwealth of civilised and Christian men, would instantly acquire a right to speak out aloud. (Cheers.) And now my Lord, I must touch upon one point which I acknowledge has been very painful to me. We have all watched for the last twelve months what is called the anti-Semitic movement in Germany. I look upon it with a twofold feeling; in the first place, I look upon it with abhorrence as tending to disintegrate the foundations of social life, and, secondly, with great fear lest it may tend to light up an animosity which has already taken fire in Russia and may spread elsewhere. I have read with great regret an elaborate article, full, no doubt, of minute observations, written from Prussia and published in the *Nineteenth Century* giving a description of the class animosities, jealousies, and rivalries which are at present so rife in that country. When I read that article my first feeling was one of great sorrow that the power and energy of the Old Testament should be so much greater in Brandenburg than those of the New. I am sorry to see that a society penetrated with Rationalism has not sufficient Christian knowledge, Christian power, Christian character, and Christian virtue to render it impossible that, however cultivated, refined, industrious, and energetic, the Jewish people should endanger the Christian society of that great kingdom. I have also read with pain accounts of the condition of the Russian Jews, bringing against them accusations which, if I touch upon them, I must ask my Jewish friends who hear me to believe I reject with incredulity and disgust. I have read that the cause of what has happened in Russia is that the Jews have been pliers of infamous trades, usurers, immoral, demoralising, and I know not what. When I read these accusations, I ask, "Is outrage the remedy? Will they be cured by outrage, murder, abominations of every sort? Are they not learning the lesson from those who ought to teach a higher law?" Again, if it be true, which I do not believe, that they are in the condition described, are they not under penal laws? Is there anything that can degrade men more than to close against their intelligence, energy, and industry, all the honourable careers of public life? (Cheers.) Is there anything that can debase and irritate the soul of man more than to be told: "You must not pass beyond that boundary;" "You must not go within 15 miles of that frontier;" "You must not dwell in that town;" "You must live only in that province"? (Hear, hear.) I do not know how anyone can believe that the whole population can fail to be affected in its inmost soul by such laws. And, if it be possible to make it worse, this is the mode and the discipline to make it so. I hey bring these accusations against the Russian Jews. Why do they not bring them against the Jews of Germany? By the acknowledgment of the anti-Semitic movement the Jews in Germany rise head and shoulders above their fellows. (Cheers.) Why do they not bring these accusations against the Jews of France? (Cheers.) Is there any career of public utility, any path of honour, civil or military, in which the Jews have not stood side by side with their countrymen? If the charge is brought against the Jews of Russia, who will bring it against the Jews of England? (Loud cheers.) For uprightness, for refinement, for generosity, for charity, for all the graces and virtues that adorn humanity, where, I ask, will be found examples brighter, or more full of true human excellence, than in this branch of the Hebrew race? (Immense cheering, and a voice: "Thank you.") And now, my Lord, we are told that the accounts of these atrocities are not to be trusted. I ask your Lordship, if there were to appear in the newspapers of the continent long and minute narratives of murder, rapine, and other atrocities round about the Egyptian Hall, in Old Jewry, in Hounds-ditch, in Shoreditch—if it were alleged that the Lord Mayor was looking on, that the Metropolitan police did nothing, that the guards at the Tower were seen to mingle with the mob—I believe you would thank any man who gave you an opportunity of exposing and contradicting such statements. Well, then, I say we are rendering a signal service to the public departments and the Ministry of Russia by what we are doing now; and I believe it will carry consolation to the heart of the great Prince who reigns over that vast Empire. (Cheers.) But let me suppose for a moment that these things are true. And I do not found my belief in their truth on what has appeared either in the *Times* newspaper or in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, which has confirmed the statements. I hold the proofs in my own hands. (Cheers.) And from whom do they come? In an official document from the Minister of the Interior, General Ignatieff. The

resolution speaks of the laws of Russia as regards its Jewish subjects. I do not assume to be a jurist in English law, much less in Russian law; I do not pretend to say what the laws of Russia are in this respect, and I should not know what to say on the resolution, if I did not hold in my hand a Rescript of much importance. I trust I shall not be told that, like the Ukase, it is a forgery. These horrible atrocities had continued throughout May, June, and July, and in the month of August this document was issued. The first point in it is that it laments and deploras—what? The atrocities on the Jewish subjects of the Czar? By no means; but "the sad condition of the Christian inhabitants" of the Southern provinces. The next point is that the main cause of these "movements and riots," as they are called, to which "the Russian nation had hitherto been a stranger," was a commercial one. The third point is this—that this conduct of the Jews has called forth "protests on the part of the people, as manifested by acts of—what do you think? of violence and robbery." Fourthly, we are told by the Minister of the Interior that the country is subject "to malpractices which were, it is known, the cause of the agitation." My Lord Mayor, if the logic of this document be calm, the rhetoric and insinuations of it are most inflammatory; and I can hardly conceive how with that Rescript in their hands the Russian people should not have felt that they were encouraged to go on with their violence. (Cheers.) The document then goes on to say "We have appointed a Commission to inquire"—into what? "First, what are the trades of the Jews which are injurious to the inhabitants of the place; secondly"—I beg the meeting to mark this—"What makes it impracticable to put into force the already existing laws limiting the rights of the Jews in the matter of buying and farming land and trading in intoxicants and in usury; thirdly, how shall these laws be altered so that the Jews will no longer be able to evade them, and what new laws are required to stop their pernicious conduct." Then, lastly, besides answers to the foregoing questions additional information was sought first on the usury practised by the Jews in their dealings with Christians in cities, towns and villages; secondly on the number of public houses; thirdly on the number of persons in the service of the Jews; fourthly on the extent or acreage of the land; and, lastly, on the number of Jewish agriculturists. Now we have in our hands the Russian laws affecting the Jewish subjects of the Empire. I would ask what is the remedy for a population in this state? Is it more penal laws? Is it to disqualify them from holding land? Is it to forbid them to send their children to higher places of education? All these things have been done. No, my Lord Mayor; I believe that the remedy for this state of things is twofold—first, the vital supremacy of Christian law in all its amplitude. It was not by laws like these that the Christians won the world, and won the Imperial Power to execute justice among men; it will be by laws other than these that the great Imperial Power of Russia will blend with the population of the Empire their Jewish subjects. (Hear, hear.) The other remedy I believe to be this—a stem and rigorous execution of justice upon evil-doers, coupled with an equally stern and rigorous concession of all that is right in the law of nature and of God to every man. All that is necessary for the protection of life and limb and liberty and property—all that constitutes human freedom—this, and nothing less than this, will be the remedy for the evils of which the Minister of the Interior complains. Now, my Lord, you have spoken very hopefully of what may be the effect of this meeting. Do not let us overrate it. If we believe that this meeting will have done the work, and that we may cease to speak, I am afraid its effect will not be what we desire. Neither let us underrate the effect. I believe that all through England, I may say all through the United Kingdom, there will be a response to this meeting. (Cheers.) Manchester and Birmingham have already begun, and wheresoever the English language is spoken throughout the world, that which your Lordship has said so eloquently and powerfully will be known. I believe that at the very moment that we are assembled here a meeting of the same kind is being held in New York. (Cheers.) And what is done here will be translated into every language of Europe. It will pass even the frontiers of Russia. Like the light and the air, it cannot be excluded; and wheresoever there is human sympathy upon earth the declarations that are made here and elsewhere will meet with a response that will tend to put an end to these horrible atrocities. There is but one word more that I have to say. I have endeavoured to deal with this question calmly and fairly. I have spoken on the importance of equal political justice: I should be ashamed if I were to cease to speak without saying a word on what will appeal strongly to the sympathies of Christian men. There is a Book, my lord, which is common to the race of Israel and to us Christians. That Book is a bond between us, and in that Book I read that the people of Israel are the oldest people upon the earth. Russias and Austrias and Englands are but of yesterday compared with the imperishable people which—with an inextinguishable life and immutable traditions, and faith in God and in the laws of God, scattered as it is all over the world, passing through the fires unscathed, trampled into the dust and yet never combining with the dust into which it is trampled—lives on still a witness to us, a witness and a warning. We are in the bonds of brotherhood with it. The New Testament rests upon the Old. They believe in half of that for which we would give our lives. Let us, then, acknowledge that they are united with us in a common sympathy. I read in that Book these words: "I am angry with a great anger with the wealthy nations that are at ease, because I was a little angry with Israel and they helped forward the affliction." That is, "My people were scattered; they suffered unknown and unimaginable sufferings, and the nations of the world that dwelt at ease and were wealthy and had power in their hands, scourged them and helped forward the mighty affliction which was upon

them already." My Lord, I only hope that not one man in England, who calls himself a civilised or Christian man, will have it in his heart to add by a single word to that which this great, and ancient, and afflicted people suffer, but that we shall do all we can by labour, by speech, and by prayer to lessen if it be possible, or at least to keep ourselves from sharing in sympathy with, these atrocious deeds. (Loud cheers.)

The REV. CANON FARRAR said—My Lord Mayor, Ladies and Gentlemen: I will not waste your time with any apologies for having accepted the invitation to second the resolution which has just been moved. I must confess that I feel considerable surprise at the amount of opposition which has been offered to this expression of sympathy. I think it is a very good rule when your feelings are appealed to in a matter of this kind to read not only what is said by those who agree, but also what is said by those who disagree with the leaders of the movement; and therefore I took the pains to read what was said by Russian newspapers, including such newspapers as the *Journal de St Pétersbourg*, as well as what was said in English newspapers. I noticed, in the first place, that our opponents called this agitation anti-Christian and anti-philanthropic. These are charges which may be safely passed by. Then they went on to say that our indignation was founded upon a mass of falsehoods and exaggerations; that we were desirous—to quote words which have been already quoted by Lord Shaftesbury—of "setting English society and Russian society by the ears"; and that these events were being seized upon by the Opposition to weaken and embarrass the Government of Mr. Gladstone. This last charge has already been dealt with and therefore I will not take up your time by dwelling upon it, but I will deal with the question of falsehoods and exaggerations. We should be only too glad to believe that there have been some exaggerations and even falsehoods in the details which have been given respecting atrocities committed upon the Jews; but, nevertheless, it is quite certain that events which have been recorded by all European newspapers are no fictions, those accounts being in accord with Russian documents of undisputed authority, authenticated by names, and dates, and places. The statements made have been supported not merely by Jews, but also by other persons who have examined into the facts for themselves, and have written on the subject with scrupulous impartiality. The suggestion or idea that this is a political agitation has been already scattered to the winds. Surely the Duke of Westminster and Lord Rosebery are not men who are likely to desire to embarrass Mr. Gladstone's Government. (Laughter.) The requisition to the Lord Mayor asking him to convene this meeting was signed by men who, like myself—not that I would ask the meeting to attach any importance to my own politics—have always been Liberals, and I am sure that not one of those who signed it could even for a moment think of dragging the sacred name of charity into the noisy arena of party politics—(cheers)—there is not one of them who would not be ashamed to make an agitation in the cause of humanity an engine of political warfare. The charge of fostering enmity against Russia is sufficiently disposed of by the names of those who have spoken at this meeting. The noble Earl who moved the first resolution has devoted his whole life to the promotion of peace and happiness among his fellow-men. The Archbishops of Canterbury and York, who preside over the Church of England; the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, whose name has never been wanting when the sacred cause of charity had to be pleaded for; the Bishop of London and the Bishop of Oxford, both present on this occasion, and the numerous ministers of other religious denominations who have expressed their approval of our object—these are men of whom I may say that the first principle of their religion is the universal Fatherhood of God and the universal brotherhood of man. (Loud cheers.) I am afraid the fact that Prince Lobanoff would not transmit the singularly moderate and respectful Memorial of the Jews in London did indicate that there was a certain amount of irritation; but nothing could be further from the intention of this meeting than the fostering of such irritation; we only want to make a kind and a friendly remonstrance. From the time when the son of Vladimir Monomachos, one of the greatest among the early Russian princes, wooed and won the daughter of Harold, the last and greatest of our Saxon kings, down to the time when a daughter of the Imperial House found, we trust, a happy home among us, the chief, if not the only interruption in our friendly relations with Russia has been the Crimean War, the memory of which has been so completely effaced in this country that when the late Czar perished by the hands of dastardly assassins we expressed as with one voice the deepest and most respectful sympathy. But although the two nations are now perfectly friendly we cannot give up our right to raise a remonstrance when a remonstrance is needed; and it is impossible to say that it is not needed when there have been murder, pillage, and conflagration, and men, women, and little innocent children have been left perfectly unprotected, and are still left in trembling apprehension, lest they should fall victims to brutal violence. There are towns in Russia where at this moment Jews are afraid to show their faces, and where, being horror-stricken at the treatment which they have received one day, they tremble lest cruelties of the same kind should be repeated the next day with still more brutal violence. Under these circumstances we claim a right to remonstrate against men of high rank, who by words and actions have fostered this deplorable hatred between race and race; against those Russian officials who have not acted with sufficient energy and promptitude; and against Russian newspapers which by their articles have swollen these insensate cries of envy and hatred. Of course I do not for a single moment dream—none of us, I am sure, can dream—of charging the Russian Church, or the Russian Government, or the Emperor, with

any complicity in or condonation of these abominable actions. We are perfectly certain that to the Czar and to high ecclesiastics, and to all high-minded Christian Russians, these deeds are as hateful as they are to ourselves; but for that very reason we ought to point out that in the dominions of the Czar there are those who do not share these sentiments or think that greater protection ought to be afforded to the Jews. My Lord Mayor, when a few years ago we got the news of the Bulgarian atrocities all England thrilled from end to end with horror and detestation. I, for one, fully concede that the position of the Turkish Government in relation to the Bulgarian atrocities was wholly different from the relation of the Russian Government to the outrages on the Jews; but the crimes were analogous, and in many instances identical; and why, when the Bulgarian atrocities were denounced with burning indignation, are the annals of the Russian atrocities to be listened to with freezing apathy? (Cheers.) Is it because the sufferers in one case were Bulgarians and in the other are Jews? Is it because the offenders in one case were Mahomedans and in the other are Christians? Is it because one Government was weak and the other is mighty? Is it because in one case the atrocities were committed amid the turbulence of war and in the other in the depths of peace? Is it because one was a sort of spasm in a comparatively transient agony and the other the outcome of deep-seated and long-continued disease? (Loud cheers.) It is because we feel friendship for Russia that we claim the right to remonstrate, as we have always done in such cases. It is a positive duty that England should make her voice heard, and that she should not speak "with bated breath or whispering humbleness." The voice of England has always been heard, thank God! on the side of the oppressed. We all know how Queen Elizabeth received the French ambassador in London after the massacre of St. Bartholomew. We know how 5,000 brave Englishmen went to fight in the Low Countries against the tyranny of Alva. We know in what a voice of thunder Cromwell demanded toleration for the Albigenses. We know in what tones Milton wrote after the massacre in Piedmont. It has been part of our traditional policy to show our sympathy with down-trodden nationalities. We have sympathised with Poles, and Syrians, and Slaves, and Neapolitans. We have fought for Greeks at Navarino, and even for Turks at Alma and at Inkerman, and we have fought for what we believed to be the liberties of Europe again and again, from the days of Blenheim and Ramillies to those of Talavera and Waterloo. The Jews are at once the noblest and the most trampled-upon nationality in the world. Their religion was the cradle of Christianity. The Jews have among them names which, as Sir Walter Scott says, as compared with any of our names, are like the gourd to the cedar, and which go back to the time when the voice of God shook the mercy-seat between the Cherubim. It is to the Jewish nation that humanity owes the deepest debt of gratitude, and it is on that nation that humanity has inflicted the deepest wrongs. I will detain you but one moment longer. We are approaching Russia in the most respectful and the most friendly spirit; and because we are friendly and because we are united, and because the faithful wounds of a friend are better than the deceitful kisses of an enemy, we ask Russia to do what England has done, and give the Jews equal rights and privileges. We have abolished persecutions prolonged from age to age, we have done away with the Ghetto and the torturing whip, and the garb's disgrace, and such summons to Christian fellowship; we have abolished all such things, and almost every other great nation has, like ourselves, accorded to the Jews the rights of civilised men. Surely Russia will not stand alone in her treatment of the Jewish nation? With us the Jews are loyal and useful citizens, and so they would be in Russia if Russia listened to our appeal. Russia has always shown herself keenly sensitive to European opinion; she has an honourable desire to take what she believes to be her true place among the nations of Europe. We have a higher opinion of Russia than to think that she would wreak indignation against the Jews because our sympathy for them has been expressed. We believe that she will follow the example of other European nations. It is because we believe that good is stronger than evil, and justice and mercy stronger than hate and wrong, that we feel perfectly sure that this meeting will not have been held in vain. We are here to raise the voice of England in the cause of mercy and justice, and we believe that that voice will be expressed in no uncertain tones. (Loud cheers.)

The resolution was then put and carried.

PROFESSOR BRYCE, M.P., said—My Lord Mayor, Ladies, and Gentle-men, I feel honoured in being asked to address this meeting. I happen to be one of those who took an active part in the agitation which was raised by the Bulgarian massacres five years ago, and suppose it is for that reason that I have been asked to bear witness, or rather to confirm the testimony already given, that those who then spoke out *so* strongly against atrocities committed by Mahomedans against Christians feel now similar indignation against the attacks made by Christians upon Jews. I do not, indeed, intend to draw a parallel between the case of the Bulgarian atrocities and the case of the recent cruelties in Russia, because in what has lately happened in Russia we have to charge the Government of that country with remissness or neglect, not with complicity, while the fiendish cruelties which took place in Bulgaria were actually approved by the Turkish authorities, who promoted some of their most notorious perpetrators. But when all due allowance has been made for possible exaggerations with regard to the persecution of the Jews in Russia there remains quite enough not only to justify the holding of this meeting but to make the holding of it a matter of necessity and of duty. We are bound to express our opinion as to the conduct of those who have joined in the commission of these horrors even with a stronger voice than is heard

from any other nation in Europe, because we in England have admitted the Jews to complete political and civil equality with Christians, because Jews have been allowed to sit on the highest seats of Justice, because many of them are to be found in the learned professions, and because there are so many Jews of whom we feel proud when we think of them as our fellow-countrymen. Our own experience, as well as the political principles we hold, has convinced us that the true way to do justice socially to men in the position of the Jews and to make them good members of society is to grant to them the fullest political and civil equality. I will not say any more on that point because it has already been dealt with by previous speakers. The resolution which I have to propose is as follows:—"That the Lord Mayor be requested to forward a copy of those resolutions to the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone and the Right Hon. Earl Granville, in the hope that Her Majesty's Government may be able, when an opportunity arises, to exercise a friendly influence with the Russian Government in accordance with the spirit of the preceding resolutions." Now that resolution does not suggest—it would not be right to suggest—what is commonly called diplomatic action. It would be a mistake, a great mistake, for us to call upon the Government for diplomatic action in a matter of this kind. We know how sensitive the Governments of Europe are as regards diplomatic representations in matters which affect their own conduct. It was only yesterday that I read in a newspaper that the King of Italy had made a speech, received with acclamation in the Italian Parliament, in which he referred to a report that Prince Bismarck was going to intervene on behalf of the Pope. His Majesty disclaimed with the utmost warmth the idea that the Italian Government would listen to any foreign intervention or representation on subjects connected with its own internal affairs. The position of the Pope in Rome is one which would justify, if anything could, intervention on the part of the Governments of other countries, because the Pope occupies somewhat of an international position, and because he is the spiritual head of a Church to which many of the Sovereigns of Europe belong. If the Government of Italy refuses to allow any diplomatic intervention in that case, how could we expect to find the Russian Government otherwise than irritated by any attempt at diplomatic action on the part of our Government on behalf of the Jews in Russia? It is because we know that diplomatic action, in the strict sense of the term, is impossible that we think a meeting like this of such great value. A meeting like this is, in fact a far better representation of the feelings of the people of England on the subject than any diplomatic action could be. (Hear, hear.) The spontaneity of this meeting, the enthusiasm that characterises it, the fact that there are assembled on this platform persons of almost every political party and of almost every religious denomination, and that not a voice has been raised throughout the country against holding this meeting, although a fortnight has passed since it was convened, these things afford the best proof that the heart of England is stirred on this question, and that the voice of England is heard in its proceedings. It is to be feared that the evil against which we are met to protest is not confined to Russia, but extends throughout the whole of South-Eastern Europe. It was my fortune about sixteen years ago to travel along the borders of Moldavia and Wallachia, and in the course of my travels I saw on the roads a number of Jews flying for their lives from Moldavia before an enraged crowd who had been incited against the Jews by a report spread in a district in which cholera had broken out that they had poisoned the wells. This burst of brutality is a phenomenon to be found all over South-Eastern Europe, and it is a phenomenon which is not confined to the less civilised peoples, for it has found expression, not, indeed, in so terrible a form, but it has found expression in the so-called anti-Semitic movement which we have seen with so much regret in Germany. It is, indeed, enough to make one blush for modern civilisation to think that a people like the Jews—a people whose ancient literature is so sacred in our eyes, on whose ancient religion our own is based, who have rendered such eminent services to learning and science—in the nineteenth century should be subjected to such terrible persecutions. What we may fairly say to our Government under these circumstances is this:—"We recognise the obstacles to direct diplomatic representations. We leave it to you how, when, and in what manner you will express to the Russian Government the sentiments which we entertain regarding these persecutions, and which we believe you share. But we hope and trust that you will discover some appropriate mode of expressing them, and of using your influence, the influence of England, on behalf of these unhappy sufferers." It is because I believe that this question is one upon which all Englishmen are agreed, because this movement is far above the range of party politics, that I believe we may have confidence in our Government. I do say unhesitatingly and I believe that there is no man living who has earned more a title to be believed and to be trusted in a matter of this kind than Mr. Gladstone. (Cheers.) What I understand this resolution to do is to recognise the difficulties which stand in the way of formal diplomatic action, and to strengthen the hands of the Government by declaring that we hope and trust that opportunities will not be wanting for making the voice of England heard in this matter. I understand that we desire to encourage the Government to speak when they may have an opportunity of doing so, and to assure them that when they do speak it will be with the voice of united England. (Cheers.) We desire to see an extension to every country of those great principles of religious toleration and civil equality which we were the first to establish as a nation, and the maintenance of which, while it conduces to our greatness and our happiness, is an inseparable bond between us and our Jewish brethren. (Cheers.)

The HON. LYULPH STANLEY, M.P., said—It gives me great pleasure to second this resolution, and it gives me the more pleasure because by its terms it calls the attention of Her Majesty's Government to both the resolutions which have already been passed. The first resolution is an important one because it expresses the detestation which all humane men must feel at the cruelties which have been recently committed in Russia; but the second resolution is to my mind more important because it touches not only the evil but also the remedy. I think we must all feel that this being a case of race-hatred the only way to remove the spirit which creates these outrages is to treat all the inhabitants of the country as citizens in common and to make them all equal as regards civil rights. The object of the resolution which I am seconding is that the two preceding resolutions should be laid before Lord Granville and Mr Gladstone, in the hope that our Government may be able to exercise some influence over the Russian Government and thereby secure better treatment for the Jews. I entirely agree with Mr. Bryce as to the extreme delicacy of diplomatic action and the difficulty of any intervention on the part of our Government which would be at all likely to prove useful. The remedy for the evil should be thorough. I hope that such a change will be made in the position of the Jews in Russia that a renewal of such outrages as have occurred recently will no longer be possible. We all feel that these cruelties arose out of prejudice, or ignorance, or both. Is there not a danger lest by our protest we should inflame the minds of some of the Russian people and arouse a mistaken patriotism? I do not believe the Russian people generally any more than the Russian Government have any wish to put back the progress of humanity, but though the Government is to a certain extent pervaded by Western ideas' and Western civilisation, the great mass of the people are still permeated with a kind of Oriental stagnation, and we must take care that we do not make our representations in a form which would tend to injure the cause which we have at heart. Those who have followed the movement in Russia in favour of what is called Panslavism will be able to appreciate the difficulties to which I allude. We should approach the Russian people on this subject in a spirit of conciliation, and it is in that way that we shall be most likely to attain our object. There is a small sect of modern philosophers who appear to think that Russia lies beyond the pale of Western civilisation, and that that country cannot be admitted to the comity of Europe generally. If I thought that, I should not be seen proposing this resolution. It is because we believe that there is a progressive element in Russia because we believe that there exists a spirit of improvement, and that the Russian people share to a certain extent the feelings and ideas of the nations of the rest of Europe, that we hold this meeting and wish to set before the Russian people as high a standard of duty and responsibility as we set before ourselves. I don't think I need say any more with regard to the resolution. I will only remind you, in conclusion, that there have been in other countries besides Russia exhibitions of race hatred and acts of savagery. We all remember how in the United States great cruelties were inflicted on the negro population in consequence of race hatred, and how political and civil rights were denied to it by men of our own race. The United States went through an ordeal through which they got rid of this reproach to American civilisation, and a similar reproach may be got rid of in Russia. The surest plan of making a man a citizen is to think him one. Look upon the Jews as fellow-men, men of like feelings and sympathies with yourselves, and they will not be estranged from you or driven into narrowness and exclusiveness; narrowness and exclusiveness will then fade away because they will feel that they are all citizens of a common country and a common home. These are the reasons which have prompted me to take part in these proceedings. No man can say that this is a party question; and I may remark that the English people have such an amount of good in their character that when an appeal is made to their humanity and their sympathy it breaks all the bonds of party. I may remind the meeting that in the case of the Bulgarian atrocities which have been referred to so much this afternoon Lord Beaconsfield declared in his place in Parliament that his efforts to influence the country favourably to the Turkish Government had been thwarted by the strong general expression of public feeling in England, and that it had made it impossible for him to do what he could have wished. So I say now that whatever party may be in power the Prime Minister of the day cannot show himself indifferent to the claims of humanity. (Cheers.)

The LORD MAYOR then said—I have just received the following telegram from America:—"At the New York State Evangelical Alliance Meeting a resolution has been passed protesting against the persecution of the Jews in Russia. It was decided to memorialise the Russian Government thereon."

The resolution was then adopted.

The RIGHT HON. J. G. HUBBARD, M.P., said—My Lord Mayor, Never, I am sure, do you occupy a position more grateful to your own feelings than when presiding at a meeting gathered in the midst of a great trading community, on behalf of suffering humanity, and proposing an expression of sympathy in the form of material help. I trust that the appeal made to the meeting by the eloquent speakers who have preceded me will in this respect not be in vain. As regards the extent of the evil on which those speakers have dwelt, I would remark that while the charge of exaggeration is easy, refutation is difficult. I would confine my own view of the case at present to one phrase in the printed document issued by the Russian Government in self-justification—"The Russian Government ought to be its own administrator." Some expressions in that document which were read

by Cardinal Manning appeared to me to place before the meeting ample cause for holding this meeting and for the resolutions which it has adopted. I find a series of accusations against the Jews put forward to vindicate the Russian Executive. It is said that the Jews have grown rich, that they have become powerful, that they have been usurers, and that they have gratified the lower inclinations and appetites of the people around them. My Lord Mayor, it would hardly become us within a hundred yards of the Bank of England to talk of usury as being an unpardonable fault—(laughter)—and in a country one-third of whose expenditure is provided for by duties on intoxicating drinks it would hardly do to say that the Jews in Russia require such treatment as has been described because some of them sell intoxicating drinks. I think those charges simply indicate a very weak case. Further let me say it is the duty of a Government so to regulate the sale of drinks that the good order and peace of society will not be interfered with, and that is a lesson which the Government of Russia might, perhaps, learn from our own Government. It would also be well for the Russians to remember that the foundations of English commerce and industry were laid partly by Jews to whom our toleration and the spirit of our laws afforded a refuge from foreign persecution. We have had among us many a Hebrew from foreign lands whom we have gladly welcomed as a fellow-citizen. We wish to speak to Russia in the most friendly spirit, and I feel sure that, in spite of all restrictions, our remonstrance will reach those for whom it is intended, and that it will be received in a right spirit both by the rulers and by the people. We all know what has been the fate of the Memorial which was taken to the Russian Ambassador in this country, and even of the proposal to place it in the hands of our own Government in order that they might make it a subject of private and confidential communication with the representative of Russia; but such things do not exhaust all the means that are available for making our influence felt. The holding of such a meeting as this, the fact that we have such people present here and at this hour of the day, and the report of the utterances of such men as have spoken, cannot but exert an irresistible force in any civilised country. The record of what has been said will I feel certain reach the ears or eyes of those for whom it was intended; it will pass through the cordon of any amount of guards or police to the Imperial presence, it will escape the vigilance of any number of censors, it will overcome every kind of local obstacle, and we shall find that the great meeting at the Mansion House over which your Lordship has presided has not been without its effect upon the Emperor and the people of Russia. (Cheers.) The resolution which I have to submit to the meeting is one of response to the appeals which have been made by the previous speakers. I am here to represent the City of London, and I propose that we should make a response to what we have been told. We have been told of suffering men, women, and children, and this is our answer, this is the way in which we propose to help them. The right hon. gentleman then proposed the following resolution:—"That a fund be raised at the Mansion House for the purpose of contributing to relieve the distress among the Jewish population of Russia and among the refugees therefrom, which distress has been caused by the recent outrages of which they have been the victims, and also for the purpose of effecting some permanent amelioration in their condition in such manner as the Committee may deem expedient, whether by emigration or otherwise. That the Right Hon. the Lord Mayor be requested to receive contributions on behalf of such fund, and that the following gentlemen be requested to serve on the Committee, with power to add to their number:-the Lord Mayor, his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, his Eminence Cardinal Manning, the Lord Bishop of London, Sir Nathaniel de Rothschild, M.P., Mr. Alfred de Rothschild, Mr. Benjamin L. Cohen, Sir Alexander Galt, Sir Julian Goldsmid, Mr. Henry Hucks Gibbs, Alderman Sir Robert W. Carden, M.P., Alderman Sir Benjamin Phillips, Mr. Alderman Cotton, M.P., Mr. F. D. Mocatta, Rev. Canon Farrar, Dr. Asher, The Right Hon. J. G. Hubbard, M.P., Mr. Alderman and Sheriff Hanson, Mr. Alderman Fowler, M.P., Mr. Sheriff Ogg, The Hon. Moritz Ellinger, Baron G. de Worms, Mr. S. Morley, M.P., and Mr. S. Montagu."

Mr. W. FOWLER, M.P., said—My Lord Mayor, Ladies and Gentlemen, as it is quite time that this meeting should close I will only say one or two words in seconding the resolution. Having taken an active part in the remonstrances against the Bulgarian atrocities some years ago, it seems to me that I ought now to do what I can in support of the remonstrances against the recent atrocities in Russia. I admit that the cases are very different. While the Turkish Government was to a large extent responsible for the atrocities in Bulgaria, we are assured that the Russian Government is not responsible for the atrocities against the Jews. I trust that that is so: but supposing it to be so, it appears clear that the officers and servants of the Russian Government were not as active as they ought to have been in the suppression or prevention of outrages, and I think we should not be afraid to lift up our voice in remonstrance lest somebody in Russia should be displeased at our doing so. I think we have a right to say what we think and feel on this subject—a right to ask that the Jews of Russia shall in future be safe against outrage. We have no right to interfere in the internal affairs of Russia, and I should be the last man to wish to do so; but we have a right to remonstrate against cruelties like those which have occurred recently. I most heartily second the resolution. I could say a great deal more, but you have heard most eloquently expressed by other speakers all that need be said on this subject, and I think any further words from me would now be out of place.

The resolution was then put and carried with acclamation.

SIR NATHANIEL DE ROTHSCHILD, M.P., said—My Lord Mayor, Ladies and Gentlemen, the last resolution prepared for this great meeting has been placed in my hands; and, although I am aware of my own inefficiency and of my lack of eloquence, yet I have not hesitated to come forward to propose that our best thanks should be given to you, my Lord Mayor, for having convened this great meeting. As Englishmen and Englishwomen we have to-day shown our deep sympathy with the oppressed; we have shown once more that men of all classes and creeds in this country are friends of civil and religious liberty. It is, indeed, no new thing for a meeting like the present one to be held in the heart of this great metropolis; for the city of London has always been the champion of civil and religious liberty. It is owing to the exertions in the past of the citizens over whom you, my Lord Mayor, rule, that my co-religionists in this country have been able to overcome all difficulties and to enjoy equal rights and equal privileges with their fellow-citizens. (Cheers.) The persecution and oppression of the Jews is a thing of all ages and of all countries; but toleration is, I may say, a child of modern growth, and it is only of late that the world has appreciated the ad-vantages of toleration. Some of the responsible authorities of Russia may have thought that outrages like those which have recently occurred might be prevented by severe penal laws. So far back as 1831, Lord Macaulay wrote an essay on the position of the Jews. I do not intend to weary you by quoting the whole of it, but I will give you the spirit of it:—"Supposing," said Lord Macaulay, "all red-headed people had been forced for hundreds of years to wear a peculiar garb, and to live together in vile ghettos, and supposing they had been denied the rights of common citizenship, and not allowed to carry on ordinary trade, would you, at the end of centuries, persecute red-headed people because they lived together, dress differently, and do not follow the same occupations as their persecutors?" Such, my Lord Mayor, was the position of my unfortunate co-religionists in Russia up to a few years ago. I acknowledge, and gratefully acknowledge, that the laws which were passed to regulate Jewish life in Russia in times gone by were allowed to lapse into desuetude. But what is the outlook for the Jews now? Outrages have occurred, and a Commission is sitting, not to grant civil and religious liberty, but to see how the laws which have reduced the Jews in Russia to the position described by Macaulay in 1831 can be put in force again. (Cries of "Shame.") My Lord Mayor, we have been assembled here to-day not merely to express sympathy but to afford material help to the oppressed, such help as is always afforded through the Mansion House when any great calamity has occurred. I am sure my co-religionists in Russia will feel very grateful for any material help which may come to them from England, but they will feel still more grateful if the views which have been expressed to-day shall have the effect of securing for them civil and religious liberty. (Loud cheers.)

MR. SERJEANT SIMON, M.P., said—My Lord Mayor, Ladies and Gentlemen, at this late hour it would be unbecoming were I to take up much of your time. The object of the meeting has been so well and so ably explained by the eloquent speakers who have preceded me that it is quite needless for me to dilate upon it. My object in rising is simply to second the vote of thanks to the Lord Mayor which Sir Nathaniel de Rothschild has just proposed. (Cheers.) In doing so I desire to thank the Lord Mayor personally for the kind and ready way in which he responded to the requisition which was placed before him. I desire also for myself—and I am sure I may say for my brethren of the Jewish faith—to thank the eminent persons not of that faith who signed that requisition; and I further desire to thank the distinguished men who adorn this platform to-day, and the whole of this great assembly, for the sympathy which they have manifested in the cause. We have not come here to do, or to say, one single thing which might disturb the friendly relations that exist between this kingdom and Russia. Least of all would we desire anything that might embarrass Her Majesty's Government, or increase the responsibilities which now press heavily upon them. We do not and we cannot ask them to assume towards Russia a peremptory tone in this matter. I should as an Englishman protest against any such action on the part of any foreign Power towards this country. I agree with my hon. and learned friend Professor Bryce that we declare, by the resolutions which have been passed, our confidence that the Government of England, representing this great nation, will do its duty. (Cheers.) I believe that it will. I believe that the Government will lose no opportunity that may present itself for using the great influence which it possesses, by friendly, unofficial means, to do what it can for the sufferers from the great calamity which has befallen them. They must speak to Russia as one friend speaks to another. It is only by acting in this spirit that any good can result from a meeting like this. We have met to denounce a great wrong to civilisation, a great offence against the laws of humanity; and we call public attention to the subject in order that the moral force of public opinion in a country like England may be felt, and may receive attention. I believe that it will. I will say no more, but simply ask you to pass a vote of thanks to the Lord Mayor, who so readily convened this meeting and who has conducted its proceedings in such an admirable manner.

The motion was then put by the proposer and carried by acclamation.

THE LORD MAYOR said—My Lords, Ladies and Gentlemen, I thank you very much for the way in which you have received this resolution of thanks to myself. Sir Nathaniel de Rothschild spoke of his want of eloquence, but we have learnt to-day that he is eloquent—he speaks from the heart, and I may add that he and his family are always ready to aid in works of charity by the most munificent donations. (Cheers.) There is another

name which I should here like to mention, that of Sir Moses Montefiore. (Cheers.) Sir Moses is a fellow-liveryman of mine in the Merchant Taylors' Company. I know that he takes great interest in City affairs, but the fact that he has also made strenuous efforts on behalf of his kinsmen in Russia will, I am sure, commend his name to a meeting like this. The City of London has, I may remark, been the cradle of civil and religious liberty in England, and within her precincts have arisen, as we have been reminded by Sir Nathaniel de Rothschild, some of the greatest industries that have enriched our country. These industries were brought here, and were taught to our people, by men who had fled from persecution abroad, and this is a fact which it is important that we should bear in mind. I believe that whoever may be Lord Mayor of London when either the cause of charity or the cause of civil and religious liberty requires to be promoted, you will find him prepared to render all the assistance in his power. (Loud cheers.)

The meeting, which had been marked by earnest enthusiasm throughout, then separated.

Appendix.

List of Towns in the United Kingdom,

Where Meetings have been held to protest against the Persecution of the Jews in Russia, and to evince Public Sympathy with the Victims.

Ashton-under-Lyne, Bedford, Birmingham, Brighton, Bristol, Bur-slem, Cambridge, Cardiff, Cheltenham, Coventry, Dover, Dublin, Edinburgh, Falmouth, Glasgow, Hanley, Hartlepool (West), Hastings, Hull, Leamington, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Longton, Manchester, Merthyr, Middlesborough, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Nottingham, Oxford, Plymouth, Portsmouth, Ramsgate. Sheffield, Shields (North), Shields (South), Stroud, Southampton, Sunderland, Swansea, Wolverhampton.

A Letter, to Express Sympathy with the Jews in Russia,

Signed by the Resident Graduates of the University of Oxford, and forwarded to the Rev. the Chief Rabbi, Dr. N. M. Adler, in London, in the month of February, 1882.

"SIR,—We the undersigned, Resident Graduates of the University of Oxford, desire to convey through you to our fellow-countrymen of the Jewish faith the assurance of our sympathy with your people in Russia under the grievous sufferings and wrongs which have recently befallen them. We have heard with surprise and indignation of outbreaks which seem to recall the unreasoning antipathies and savage cruelties of the Middle Ages. We earnestly hope that the day may not be distant when in every country all loyal subjects shall be equal before the law, and public opinion shall secure equal justice for all alike without distinction of race or creed."

Signed:—E. Evans, D.D., Master of Pembroke College and Vice-Chancellor of the University; J. F. Bright, M.A., Master of University College; B. Jowett, M.A., Master of Balliol College and Regius Professor of Greek; G. C. Brodrick, M.A., Warden of Merton College; J. P. Lightfoot, D.D., Rector of Exeter College; J. R. Magrath, D.D., Provost of Queen's College; J. E. Sewell, D.D., Warden of New College; W. R. Anson, D.C.L., Warden of All Soul's College; F. Bulley, D.D., President of Magdalen College; E. H. Cradock, D.D., Principal of Brasenose College; J. Percival, M.A., President of Trinity College; H. D. Harper, D.D., Principal of Jesus College; G. E. Thorley, M.A., Warden of Wadham College; W. Inge, M.A., Provost of Worcester College; E. S. Talbot, M.A., Warden of Keble College; D. P. Chase, D.D., Principal of St. Mary's Hall; J. Griffiths, D.D., late Warden of Wadham College; W. Ince, D.D., Canon of Christchurch, Regius Professor of Divinity; C. A. Heurtley, D.D., Canon of Christchurch, Margaret Professor of Divinity; W. Bright, D.D., Canon of Christchurch, Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History; E. King, D.D., Canon of Christchurch, Regius Professor of Pastoral Theology; Edwin Palmer, D.D., Canon of Christchurch, Archdeacon of Oxford, late Professor of Latin; H. J. S. Smith, M.A., Savilian Professor of Geometry, Fellow of Corpus; C. Pritchard, D.D., Savilian Professor of Astronomy; Bartholomew Price, Savilian Professor of Natural Philosophy, Fellow of Pembroke; T. H. Green, M.A., Whyte's Professor of Moral Philosophy, Fellow of Balliol; G. Rawlinson, M.A., Camden Professor of Ancient History; M. A. Lawson, M.A., Professor of Botany; G. F. Nicholl, M.A., Lord Almoner's Professor of Arabic and Oriental Lecturer of Balliol College; W. Stubbs, D.D., Regius Professor of Modern History; J. Earle, M.A., Professor of Anglo-Saxon; Joseph Prestwich, M.A., Professor of Geology; Monier Williams, D.C.L., Professor of Sanskrit; H. Nettle-ship, M.A., Professor of Latin, Fellow of Corpus; T. E. Holland, D.C.L., Professor of International Law, Fellow of All Souls; Montagu Burrows, M.A., Chichele Professor of Modern History, Fellow of All Souls; W. Odling, M.A., Professor of Chemistry; J. O. Westwood, M.A., Professor of Zoology; F. Max Muller, M.A., Professor of Comparative Philology, Fellow of All Souls; A. H. Sayce, M.A., Deputy Professor of Comparative Philology, Fellow of Queen's; James Legge, M.A.,

Professor of Chinese; J. Rhys, M.A., Professor of Celtic, Fellow of Jesus; W. W. Capes, M.A., University Reader in Ancient History, Fellow and Tutor of Hertford; E. T. Turner, M.A., Registrar of the University, Fellow of Brazenose; W. W. Merry, M.A., Public Orator, Fellow and Tutor of Lincoln; William Markby, D.C.L., Merton College, University Reader in Indian Law; J. T. Platts, M.A., Balliol College, University Teacher of Persian; A. P. Thomas, M.A., Demonstrator of Anatomy, University Museum; E. J. Stone, M.A., Christ Church, Ratcliffe Observer; A. G. Vernon Harcourt, M.A., Christ Church, Lee's Reader in Chemistry; J. Barclay Thompson, M.A., Christ Church, Lee's Reader in Anatomy; Robert E. Baynes, M.A., Christ Church, Lee's Reader in Physics; Sidney J. Owen, M.A., Christ Church, Lee's Reader in Indian History; Francis Paget, M.A., Senior Student of Christ Church; Henry Scott Holland, M.A., Senior Student of Christ Church; David B. Munro, M.A., Fellow and Vice-Provost of Oriel College; F. H. Bradley, M.A., Fellow of Merton College. W. Wallace, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Merton College; W. Warde Fowler, M.A., Sub-Rector of Lincoln College; John Wordsworth, M.A., Tutor and late Fellow of Brasenose College; Walter H. Pater, Fellow and Tutor of Brasenose College; C. B. Heberden, M.A., Junior Proctor, Fellow and Tutor of Brazenosc College; S. H. Butcher, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer of University College; A. L. Chavasse, M.A., Tutor and Fellow of University College; Arthur Dendy, B.C.L., Dean and Fellow of University College; E. Armstrong M.A., Fellow of Queen's College; Wm. H. Charsley, M.A., Master of Charsley's Hall; G. W. Kitchin, M.A., Christ Church, Censor of Unattached Students of the University; James E. Thorold Rogers, M.A., Worcester College, M.P. for Southward Edwin Wallace, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Worcester College; P. A. Henderson, M.A., Sub-Warden and Fellow of Wadham College; W. W. Jackson, M.A., Sub-Rector of Exeter College; Ingram Bywater, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College; Henry F. Pelham, M.A., Lecturer and formerly Fellow of Exeter College; Henry F. Tozer, M.A., Tutor and formerly Fellow of Exeter College; W. Hawker Hughes, M.A., Fellow, Tutor, and Dean of Jesus College; Edmund S. Ffoulkcs, B.D., Jesus College, Vicar of St. Mary's; A. T. Barton, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Pembroke College; A. T. Lyttelton, M.A., Tutor of Keble College; Francis J. Chavasse, M.A., Corpus Christi College; Arthur Sidgwick, M.A., Tutor of Corpus; James Trengrove Nance, B.D., Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College; F. H. Woods, B.D., Fellow of St. John's College; H. Chaloner Ogle, M.A., Fellow of Magdalen College; Chas. J. F. Yule, M.A., Vice-President of Magdalen College; Evelyn Abbott, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Balliol; R. L. Nettleship, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Balliol; G. F. Lovell, B.U., Balliol College, Vice-Principal of St. Edmund's Hall; S. R. Driver, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of New College; Wm. Leonard Courtney, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of New College; D. S. Margoliouth, B.A., Fellow and Lecturer of New College; Alfred Robinson, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer of New College; R. Ellis, M.A., Vice-President of Trinity College; R. W. Raper, B.C.L., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College; A. H. Johnson, M.A., Lecturer of Trinity College, late Fellow of All Souls; W. P. Ker, M.A., Fellow of All Souls; C. N. Jackson, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Hertford, Senior Proctor.

And 150 other signatures.

To this address the following reply was sent by the Rev. the Chief Rabbi:—

"Reverend Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of the address signed by yourself and 245 resident members of the University of Oxford, in which you express your sympathy with my suffering co-religionists in Russia, your indignation at the cruelties which have been inflicted on them, and your hopes for the speedy advent of an era of religious equality. In the name of my community I beg to assure you of our heartfelt gratitude for this noble and spontaneous declaration. Such sentiments emanating from your ancient University, from men whose position in the realm of thought and learning lends to their utterances an exceptional weight, cannot fail to produce a profound impression and lasting effect throughout the civilised world. Such a declaration in itself cannot fail to hasten the realisation of your hopes for the not distant day when everywhere equal rights and equal justice will be dealt to all as a common heritage of humanity without distinction of race or creed.

"I have the honour to be, Reverend Sir,

"

Yours faithfully

,

"N. Adler.

"The Rev. T. Evans, D.D.,

Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford."

Wertheimer, Lea & Co., Printers, Circus Place, London Wall.

On a Few Points in the Teaching of Thomas Carlyle An Essay Read Before the Dialectical Society of Canterbury College, 30th September, 1882; By George Hogben, M.A.

"He bade me act n manly part,
Though I had ne'er a furthing, O,
For without an honest manly heart,
No man was worth regarding, O."—Buras.

Christchurch, N Z. Whitcombe & Tombs, Stationers and Printers. 1882

On a Few Points in the Teaching of Thomas Carlyle

IN the Poets' Corner of Westminster Abbey is an epitaph (that of the poet Gay), which arrests the attention of all but the most careless observers:—

"Life's a jest, and all things show it,
I thought so once, but now I know it."

Perhaps we should not be very far from the truth if we took this verselet to be the keynote of the spirit of the eighteenth century. Our own century is very different; it has regarded the problems of life with a very earnest, I might even say *anxious*, look; and one of the men who have in a very large degree contributed to the causes that have brought about this reversal of opinion is Thomas Carlyle.

To him "It is a most earnest thing to be alive in this world; to die is not sport for a man; man's life never was a sport to him; it was a stern reality, altogether a serious matter to be alive!" His character is that of his own Teufelsdröckh; "his attitude that of a man who had said to Cant, Begone, and to Dilettantism, Here thou canst not be; and to Truth, Be thou in place of all to me: a man who had manfully defied the Time-Prince, or Devil, to his face; nay perhaps, Hannibal-like, was mysteriously consecrated from birth to that warfare, and now stood minded to wage the same, by all weapons, in all places, at all times."

It will therefore be a matter of some interest to enquire into his faith, his philosophy, and to ask what answers he gave (if any) to the problems that ever present themselves to us. In doing so, we shall in vain attempt to find any exact and complete system, any formal cut-and-dried science of life, any solution in the form $a + b$ (the sum of known quantities). Possibly a steam engine might seem to be capable of being described in this easy fashion, scarcely even a steam engine when in motion; a man, or life, or nature, could never be summed up thus. To the most importunate mathematician or scientist there is never given any more satisfactory solution than this;— a (a small known quantity) + x (an infinite unknown one); those who profess to have obtained an exact integral solution have done so by neglecting the second term.

Your religious dogmatist has no difficulty in defining and accounting for the seen or the unseen; your materialist, albeit he cannot solve the problem of the mutual action of three bodies, has at his fingers' ends the infinite processes of an infinite universe; your metaphysician catalogues and measures motives as easily as sugar. With reference to which latter Carlyle says:—"Fantastic tricks enough man has played in his time; has fancied himself to be most things, down even to an animated heap of glass; but to fancy himself a dead iron balance for weighing pains and pleasures on, was reserved for this his latter era. . . . Were he not, as has been said, purblind by enchantment, you had but to bid him open his eyes and look. In which country, in which time, was it hitherto that man's history, or the history of any man, went on by calculated or calculable *motives*? What make ye of your Christianities, and Chivalries, and Reformations, and Marseillaise Hymns, and Reigns of Terror? Nay, has not perhaps, the motive-grinder himself been *in Love*? Did he never stand so much as a contested election? Leave him to Time, and the medicating virtue of Nature."

Knowing as little as we do, Nature seems full of paradoxes; Carlyle saw these, and expressed them. It would on this account be altogether a mistake to build up any complete system out of his teaching or to try to found a Carlylean School of Philosophy. He himself would not wish it, declared the thing in any real way not to be possible. The remainder of this essay will therefore merely be devoted to the consideration of those points on which he laid most stress in his teaching.

The point which separates Carlyle most from other teachers and philosophers of this age is the prominence assigned to the Individual Man. In these days our births and deaths, our cricket scores and zymotic diseases, our religious opinions and national tendencies to suicide, are all reduced to averages and percentages; and theories

and laws are propounded about us and our doings so easily, that we might almost expect in a short time to have ready-reckoners of human action, in which—given the man, country, and time—we should have only to turn to the proper page and column to find out whether he was more likely to pay his tailor, quarrel with his wife, or be an atheist. We are threatened with the loss of our notions both of individual action and individual responsibility. It is the old question of Freewill and Necessity, Arminianism and Calvinism, over again, and no nearer solution now than of old; though both sides have frequently shifted their ground. We hear such phrases as "regeneration of the masses," "growth of the mass" (in intelligence, etc.): Carlyle would remind us that there can be no regeneration or growth of the mass apart from or which does not consist in the regeneration or the growth of the individuals of which the mass is composed. Some would take the history of the world to be best shown by the history of its several races and peoples: he would take it to be "at bottom the history of the great men who have worked here—they were the leaders of men, these great ones; the modellers, patterns, and in a wide sense creators, of what-soever the general mass of men contrived to do or to attain." In many other ways he lays stress on the consideration due to the claims of the Individual; in the "French Revolution," for example, he traces much of the error of the old Regime to the ignoring of these claims, the lumping together of twenty to twenty-five millions of people "into a kind of dim compendious unity the masses. Masses indeed. And yet singular to say, if with an effort of imagination, thou follow them over broad France, into their clay hovels, into their garrets and hutches, the masses consist all of units. Every unit of whom has his own heart and sorrows; stands covered there with his own skin, and if you prick him he will bleed. O purple Sovereignty, Holiness, Reverence; thou, for example, Cardinal Grand-Almoner, with thy plush covering of honour, who hast thy hands strengthened with dignities and moneys, and art set on thy world watch-tower solemnly, in sight of God, for such ends,—what a thought: that every unit of these masses is a miraculous man, even as thou thyself art; struggling, with vision or with blindness, for *his* infinite kingdom (this life which he has got, once only, in the middle of Eternities); with a spark of the Divinity, what thou callest an immortal soul, in him." Carlyle does not altogether neglect the complementary half truth which is now made so prominent: "If now an existing generation of men stand woven together, not less indissolubly does generation with generation. We inherit not life only, but all the garniture and form of life; and work and speak, and even think and feel, as our fathers, and primeval grand-fathers have given it (*i.e.* tradition) to us. . . . Had there been no Mœsogothic Ulfila, there had been no English Shakspeare, or a different one. It was Tubalcain that made thy very tailor's needle, and sewed that court suit of thine. Mankind like nature, is *one*, and a living indivisible whole. . . . The heroic heart, the seeing eye of the first times, still feels and sees in us of the latest."—And much elsewhere to the same effect.

The two books which perhaps more than any others attach this prominence to the individual are "Sartor Resartus" and "Heroes and Hero-worship,"—the former, in the fanciful sketch of Herr Teufelsdröckh's Life and Opinions, gives an account of the severest struggles through which the human mind can pass in its strivings after right thought and right action; the latter shows us the hero, the type individual, leader and pattern of lesser men. Those who, with limited time at their disposal, wish to gain some idea of the teaching of Carlyle, cannot do better than study carefully these two books.—I say "study" advisedly, for neither of them is a book that can be profitably polished off, like a fashionable novel, between dinner-time and bed-time.

It is sometimes held, or seems to be held, that a man's private and inner character bears no relation to his fitness for affairs, or at all events for public affairs. In times of public election, a cry is often raised, in England more, perhaps, than in the Colonies, "Measures, not Men,"—as it you could reasonably hope to get, except by chance, good measures without good men. Carlyle thought far otherwise, and in "Heroes" he expresses himself thus: "It is well said, in every sense, that a man's religion is the chief fact with regard to him. A man's, or a nation of men's. By religion I do not mean here the church creed which he professes, the articles of faith which he will sign, and, in words or otherwise assert; not this wholly, in many cases not this at all. We see men of all kinds of professed creeds attain to almost all degrees of worth or worthlessness under each or any of them. This is not what I call religion, this profession and assertion; which is often only a profession and assertion from the outworks of the man, from the mere argumentative region of him, if even so deep as that. But the thing a man does practically believe (and this is often enough without asserting it even to himself, much less to others): the thing a man does practically lay to heart, and know for certain, concerning his vital relations to this mysterious Universe, and his duty and destiny there, that is in all cases the primary thing for him, and creatively determines all the rest. ... Of a man or a nation we inquire, therefore, first of all, what religion they had? . . . Answering of this question is giving us the soul of the history of the man or nation. The thoughts they had were the parents of the actions they did; their feelings were parents of their thoughts: it was the unseen and spiritual in them that determined the outward and actual;—their religion, as I say, was the great fact about them.

A most natural question which would suggest itself at once to the minds of many would be, What then was the religion of Thomas Carlyle? To which, perhaps, one might be justified, on behalf of the latter, in answering in the words of Johnson and Emerson, "All wise men have but one religion, and that religion wise men never tell." Nevertheless, I hope in the course of this essay to give materials, which, although not helping you to place

Carlyle in any religious category, will enable you to see that he had a real religion, and to judge of what calibre this religion was. Before going further, I will, moreover, quote three passages—which are not probably the best which could be chosen, but will illustrate sufficiently well his attitude towards Nature.

The first I take from "Heroes and Hero-worship," chapter I:—

"This Universe, ah me,—what could the wild man know of it; what can we yet know? That it is a Force, and thousandfold complexity of Forces; a force which is *not we*. That is all; it is not we; it is altogether different from *us*. Force, Force, everywhere Force; we ourselves a mysterious Force in the centre of that. 'There is not a leaf rotting on the highway but has Force in it: how else could it rot?' Nay, surely to the atheistic thinker, if such a one were possible, it must be a miracle too, this huge illimitable whirlwind of force, which envelops us here; never-resting whirlwind, high as Immensity, old as Eternity. What is it? Gods creation, the religious people answer; it is the al- mighty God's! Atheistic science babbles poorly of it, with scientific nomenclatures, experiments and what-not, as if it were a poor dead thing, to be bottled up in Leyden jars and sold over counters: but the natural sense of man, in all times, if he will honestly apply his sense, proclaims it to be a living thing,—ah, an unspeakable, godlike thing; towards which the best attitude for us, after never so much science, is awe, devout prostration and humility of soul; worship, if not in words, then in silence."

Secondly, in Book III. of "Sartor Resartus," we find the following:—

"We speak of the Volume of Nature: and truly a Volume it is,—whose Author and Writer is God. To read it! Dost thou, does man, so much as well know the Alphabet thereof? With its Words, Sentences, and grand descriptive Pages, poetical and philosophical, spread out through Solar Systems, and Thousands of Years, we shall not try thee. It is a volume written in celestial hieroglyphs, in the true Sacred-writing; of which Prophets are happy that they can read here a line and there a line. As for your Institutes and Academies of Science, they strive bravely; and, from amid the thick-crowded, inextricably intertwined hieroglyphic writing, pick out, by dextrous combination, some letters in the vulgar character, and therefrom put together this and the other economic recipe of high avail in practice. That Nature is more than some boundless Volume of such Recipes, a huge, well-nigh inexhaustible Domestic Cookery Book, of which the whole secret will in this manner one day evolve itself, the fewest dream."

Again, in an earlier part of the same work, Teufelsdröckh is described as wandering over some grand mountain range as the sun was setting;—

"He gazed over those stupendous masses with wonder, almost with longing desire; never till this hour had he known Nature, that she was One, that she was his Mother, and divine. And as the ruddy glow was fading into clearness in the sky, and the Sun had now departed, a murmur of Eternity and Immensity, of Death and of Life, stole through his soul; and he felt as if Death and Life were one, as if the Earth were not dead, as if the Spirit of the Earth had its throne in that splendour, and his own spirit were therewith holding communion."

It being understood then that a man's religion, or relation to the Universe, is all important, we come to the first essential of any religion, any true relation to Nature or Life at all. The first condition necessary to any kind of real perception of things, or to any sort of worthy doing, is sincerity, honesty, freedom from cant, sham, and hypocrisy. Coupled with this is a fearless bravery on the side of right, grounded on the conviction that right is right, and that wrong cannot by any juggling of words be made right. In his denunciation of what is false and unreal he is as bold and uncompromising as any Isaiah, Socrates, or Luther of past ages, and might fitly be termed our "apostle or "prophet of honesty." He would not have lived in vain if he had taught us no other lesson than this—to hate all lies and shams, under whatever forms they may appear, with a perfect hatred. No weapon was spared against all things which were, or appeared to him to be, unrealities; he assailed them in prose and parable with assertion, with argument, and with ridicule. "Man everywhere is the born enemy of lies." There is no mistake about *this* article of his creed, however misty some of the others may be. Whether these falsities be found in politics or religion, in literature or social life, it is all alike to him; with them he holds no parley, makes no truce. To him the French Revolution is a wild uprising of the forces of human nature against an accumulated growth of shams, artificialities and injustices. He counts a Sham-priest the falsest and basest of all men; rulers must cease to be quacks, or else depart; the remedies of political economists are pushed aside for evils that lie much deeper than pounds, shillings and pence; and lastly, that elegant sham, the Dandiacal Body, is dismissed with a superb sneer: thus "A Dandy is a Clothes-wearing Man, a Man whose trade, office and existence consist in the wearing of Clothes. Every faculty of his soul, spirit, purse and person is heroically consecrated to this one object, the wearing of Clothes wisely and well; so that as others dress to live, he lives to dress." It must not be supposed that Carlyle is blind to the good contained in many of these things: he fully recognises the grandeur of the Feudal System which received its death- blow when the Bastille fell: a true Priest, or Interpreter of the Holy, he recognises as the noblest and highest of all men; the true king is heaven-sent, rules by right divine; the strict demands of political economy cannot be passed over any more than the calls of hunger can; and so on.

Nevertheless, there are people who object to such fierce denunciation of what is false. They do not like to hear a lie called by such an ugly name, but would fain forget the poisonous qualities of the poppy by calling it a

rose. They say that Carlyle is one-sided, and lacks human sympathy and charity. That he is not altogether one-sided I have already pointed out; to a certain extent (especially in smaller details) every teacher or preacher is bound to be one-sided who proceeds on broad lines, and not on narrow ones. That he lacks human sympathy is a charge more generally made, but in any deep or wide sense quite without foundation. We are speaking of his teaching as contained in his books now, and I believe that there is not a book of the many he has written through which there cannot be distinctly traced a current of profound sympathy with all sorts and conditions of men. "We may pause in sorrow and silence over the depths of darkness that are in man," he says; but only "if we rejoice in the heights of purer vision he has attained to." He quotes with approval that saying of Saint Chrysostom, "The true Shekinah is man;" and, again, these words of Novalis, "There is but one temple in the world, and that temple is the Body of Man: nothing is holier than this high Form r bending before men is a reverence done to this Revelation in the Flesh: we touch heaven when we lay our hands on a human Body." The very Hatred, the very Envy, the foolish Lies which one man tells of another in his splenetic humour he states to be merely an inverted sympathy. He has pity for the proud, but ill-fated, Marie Antoinette, and for the inarticulate struggles of a Paris mob.

But, for all that, he must deliver himself of his message against Falsehood and Illusion. That a man should stand on the basis of Fact and Reality is then the first step; nay, some, for instance John Knox, have become heroic by sincerity alone; it was their grand gift. To sum up this part in Carlyle's own words:—"There is no man adequate to do anything, but is first of all in right earnest about it; what I call a sincere man. I should say *sincerity*, a deep, great, genuine sincerity is the first characteristic of all men in any way heroic."

When Teufelsdröckh, in the dirty little Rue Saint Thomas de l'Enfer had bidden Falsehood and Fear begone, and to the Everlasting No had said, Get thee behind me, there still remained a black spot in his sunshine, the Shadow of Self. The getting rid of this, or at least the burying and ignoring of it, is the next step in his onward progress. We all imagine that we have a right to be happy, and by striking a certain average of happiness according to methods of our own we arrive at the minimum of enjoyment which we consider our indefeasible right. An idea of this sort, gradually and insensibly adopted, and fostered by inclination and circumstance, must needs warp and control the whole action of our lives, and take away from our allegiance to the highest ideals that whole-heartedness which they demand. Self-regard is an insuperable barrier to all higher forms of heroism; the temper of the mind must be changed before anything truly heroic can be looked for. It matters not by what name you call this choice or change of position, or whether it takes place slowly or suddenly, consciously or unconsciously, the fact itself is of the deepest importance. The Methodist calls it Conversion; the Buddhist, Self-Renunciation; the Positivist, Devotion, Consecration to Truth; the Mystic names it Self-Death, Self-Annihilation.

Who told thee thou hadst any right to be happy? Do thy duty and die. "I tell thee, Blockhead, it all comes of thy Vanity; of what thou fanciest those same *deserts* of thine to be. Fancy that thou deservest to be hanged (as is most likely), thou wilt feel it happiness to be only shot: fancy that thou deservest to be hanged in a hair-halter, it will be a luxury to die in hemp. . . . There is in man a Higher than Love of Happiness: he can do without Happiness, and instead thereof find Blessedness!" In short—"Love not Pleasure: love God." Or if this language be too theological for you, let us put it otherwise, in the words of a mediæval German writer:—"That which is best should be the dearest of all things to us; and in our love of it neither helpfulness nor unhelpfulness advantage nor injury, gain nor loss, honour nor dishonour, praise nor blame, nor anything of the kind should be regarded; but what is in truth the noblest and best of all things, should be also the dearest of all things, and that for no other cause than that it is the noblest and best."

To many this lofty ideal is incomprehensible, to most it seems utterly unattainable. Emerson advises us thus:—"If we cannot attain at a bound to those grandeurs, at least let us do them homage. . . . There are," he says, "many eyes that can detect and honour the prudent and household virtues; there are many that can discern genius on his starry track, though the mob is incapable; but when that love which is all-suffering, all-abstaining, all-aspiring, which has vowed to itself that it will be a wretch and also a fool in this world, sooner than soil its white hands by any compliances, comes into our streets and houses—only the pure and aspiring can know its face, and the only compliment they can pay it, is to own it." A wild, Utopian, and impossible ideal! and so men dismiss it. Yet let us not do so. Who shall place bounds to what is possible for any human soul? When the safety of Rome trembles in the balance, and Curtius stands mounted in the Forum, who shall forbid him to take the fatal leap?

But even this temper of mind, if by pain and difficulty it be achieved, does not solve all questions—indeed, merely prepares the way for the clear statement of the questions to be solved. The great dispeller of the mists which remain is Work. "*Do the Duty which lies nearest thee*" which thou knowest to be a Duty! Thy second Duty will already have become clearer. Earnest work of almost any kind brings a man into contact with Fact and with Nature; order and harmony appear where confusion reigned before. The man is now a man. If the work be *true* work, he is not only in communication with Nature, but in unison with it—he is "part and parcel

of great Nature's Law." "All true Work," says Carlyle in his "Past and Present," "is sacred; in all true Work, were it but true hand-labour, there is something of divineness." Work may be true, and even heroic, although it may be unsuccessful to all outward appearance. And this, perhaps, will be the place to speak of a charge that is sometimes brought in strongly positive terms against Carlyle—that of worship-ping success. A very superficial knowledge of his works would have been enough, I should have thought, to have overturned, or to have considerably qualified this judgment. It is founded principally on his admiration, or supposed admiration, for Cromwell, Napoleon, and Frederick the Great. With regard to the first, his admiration certainly does not depend upon the success of his hero; no one, however, can deny that the patient and exhaustive work, the results of which are contained in the five volumes of Cromwell's Life and Letters, has materially changed the opinion of all but the most bigoted historians as to the character of the Great Protector, Napoleon Carlyle calls an unconscious divine missionary, who "preached, through the cannon's throat, that great doctrine, *La carriiure ouverte aux talens* (the tools to him that can handle them)"; and, while admitting Napoleon's insight into facts and scornful disregard of shams, he yet judges him to have had no such *sincerity* as Cromwell, and finally to have been led away by ambition and self-deception to false purposes and so to ruin.

I am not prepared to give an opinion upon Frederick the Great, as I have not made a study of it; it is, however, no secret that the work grew more and more distasteful to Carlyle, and his self-respect alone induced him to accomplish the task, and make it at least a complete history of the great Fritz.

For more positive evidence that he did not worship mere success, we have his charming Life of John Sterling, a man who, though a good, generous, true, and perfectly transparent soul, was by no means successful according to any ordinary modes of measuring success. Again, in his lecture on the Hero as Prophet, he characterises "David's life and history, as written for us in those Psalms of his," as "the truest emblem ever given of a man's moral progress and warfare here below"; and goes on to say—"All earnest souls will ever discern in it the faithful struggle of an earnest human soul towards what is good and best. Struggle often baffled, sore baffled, down as into entire wreck; yet a struggle never ended; ever with tears, repentance, true unconquerable purpose begun anew. Poor human nature! Is not a man's walking in truth always that, 'a succession of falls?' Man can do no other. In this wild element of a Life he has to struggle onwards; now fallen, deep-abased; and ever with tears, repentance, with bleeding heart, he has to rise again, struggle again still onwards. That his struggle *be* a faithful, unconquerable one: that is the question of questions!" This, surely, is not worship of success.

Of course, success in right work is not a bad thing, but a good thing; yet, if work be judged merely by the outward success of it, by the glory which it brings to the man, and the noise it causes in the world, the simple, real, earnest aim itself is soon lost sight of, and a passing fame or notoriety is looked for instead; and then, when the fireworks are all burnt out, there is left to us—just the smell of the powder. This over anxiety for success and fame is chiefly due to a desire for a reward for work, a price for one's life. He that is truly heroic looks for no reward except the consciousness of having finished the work he was given to do. Providence, indeed, knows of no higher reward for duty done than the acknowledgment that it has been well done, as by a good and faithful servant. It is no common or coarse material that the true worker uses, however rough the externals of his work may be; the cost to him is his own heart's blood, his very life, and what shall be the price of that. "My brother," says Carlyle, "the brave man has to give his life away; he never could sell it, or any part of it, in a satisfactory manner. He gives it, therefore, like a royal heart."

All work is good, even Mammonism; anything we are in earnest about; yet all work is not worthy work. The Gospel of Mammonism indeed, whose Heaven is success in money-making, and whose Hell is failure therein, though adopted and more or less openly professed by all English peoples, and after them by the rest, has led to strange conclusions. What we call Society, or union of interests, is in reality the total separation, isolation. Our life, so far as it is regulated by these rules, is not a mutual helpfulness; but rather, cloaked under due laws of war, named "fair competition," and so forth, it is a mutual hostility. Under this guidance we forget that cash payment is not the sole relation of human beings, and neglect or become careless in the performance of those duties to which there correspond no entries in our ledgers. There is no sure foundation, no reality in such Philosophy; and the man or nation of men that thinks there is, must come in the end to chaos and confusion.

Earnest work is the hope of the world,—for, in spite of mistaken notions to the contrary, Carlyle did not despair of the future of the world; he was not a pessimist. We find him saying: "Light is coming into the world; men love not darkness, they do love light Some Chivalry of Labour, some noble Humanity and practical Divineness of Labour will yet be realized on this Earth." And it must begin in the Present if it is to be accomplished in the Future." Here or nowhere, now equally as at anytime." Therefore "subdue mutiny, discord, widespread despair, by manfulness, justice, mercy, and wisdom..... Unstained by wasteful deformities, by wasted tears or heart's blood of men, or any defacement of the Pit, noble, fruitful Labour, growing ever nobler, will come forth,—the grand, sole miracle of Man; whereby Man has risen from the low places of this Earth,

very literally into divine Heavens. Ploughers, Spinners, Builders, Prophets, Poets, Kings, Brindleys, and Goethes, Odins and Arkwrights; all martyrs, and noble men, and gods are of one grand Most; immeasurable, marching ever forward since the beginning of the World. The enormous, all-conquering, feme-crowned Host, noble every soldier in it; sacred, and alone noble. Let him who is not of it hide himself; let him tremble for himself. Stars at every button cannot make him noble; sheaves of Bath-garters, nor bushels of Georges; nor any other contrivance but manfully enlisting in it, valiantly taking place and step in it."

This, then, is the sum of Carlyle's teaching as regards the Individual Man:—(1) An earnest sincerity of purpose and performance; (2) A Complete Renunciation of Self, and a reverent attitude towards Nature, towards whatever is higher than ourselves; (3) Faithful and worthy Work.

We pass on next to that part of his teaching which bears more directly on the duties of men in a Society, and on Government. Hero-worship affords the link between this branch of the subject and that which has already been taken up. In his lectures on Heroes, and elsewhere throughout his works, Carlyle has shown a keen appreciation for men of all ranks and departments of life who have done true and lasting work in this world; to the Individual they are pointed out as patterns and models, as parts of the great infinite Nature for which his reverence is demanded. But, more than this, great men are the natural rulers of their race; to them the government belongs—all others are usurpers and unrealities. The discoverability of the Hero is the difficulty—whom to reverence, whom to obey. The old methods have done their work, and are now worn out; our kings and queens for the most part are mere pleasant shadows, from whom the danger is less because they are generally known and acknowledged to be shadows. Our Aristocracy (though this is not so true as it was thirty or forty years ago), our Hengsts and soforth, are for the most part busy, preserving their game; our Prime Ministers, or nearest approximations to kings, are at present merely the mouthpieces of a Democracy, removable at the whim of the said Democracy. Carlyle held and expressed strongly many ideas usually classed as democratic. For instance, he recognised no rank but worth, or worthiness of soul; he looked through all outward titles, circumstances, and paraphernalia whatever—"a man's a man for a that"—and asked what of the heroic mind and power there was in a man. Nothing could be more democratic, in the popular sense, than his cynical summing up of war. Thirty British artizans are impressed as soldiers, and meet thirty similar French artizans. "Straightway, the word 'Fire!' is given, and they blow the souls out of one another; and in place of sixty brisk, useful craftsmen, the world has sixty dead car-cases, which it must bury and anew shed tears for. Had these men any quarrel? Busy as the Devil is, not the smallest! They lived far enough apart; were the entirest strangers; nay, in so wide a Universe there was even, unconsciously, by commerce, some mutual helpfulness between them. How then? Simpleton! Their Governors had fallen out; and, instead of shooting one another, had the cunning to make these poor blockheads shoot. Alas, so it is in Deutschland, and hitherto in all other lands; still, as of old, 'what devilry soever kings do, the Greeks must pay the piper!" Yet he was strongly opposed to Democracy, to government by the Demos or Mass. And his objection is one very difficult to answer; it is in effect: How can you expect a nation of unheroic souls to carry out an heroic policy, or a mass of unwise nonentities to select the wise and discerning men in their midst? Democracy, he thinks, leads inevitably to confusion and anarchy; such government is indeed, while it lasts, only a modified and chronic anarchy. And out of anarchy and chaos can come nothing good, except by the suppression of anarchy. Anarchy is only excusable when the previously existing government of a country is one vast, persistent s justifiable even then. "Of all the resources that may be open to you, "he says in a letter to a young man, "try Revolution last." "Revoltng," he characterises in his "Irish Notes" as "the unprofitablest of all trades."

The only answer perhaps possible to Carlyle's question is the counter-question already suggested: How are you going to find your Hero-King? And this is no true answer; for difficulties in the way of right action give no reason for perseverance in wrong action.

A Parliament is composed of the delegates of a democracy, and is, as it were, a compressed or concentrated democracy—with its different elements—its unwisdoms, self-seeking aims, and chaotic cries for redress of unknown or imaginary grievances, as well as its wiser and truer demands, and its inspirations of justice and liberty, all represented. Now a Parliament may be looked at in two ways: it may be regarded as expressing the wants and wishes of the nation, and therefore as a body to be consulted by the Sovereign or executive King of a Nation; or it may itself enact the Sovereign ruler and be supreme over all things. It is very important that these two functions of Parliaments, Consultation and Ruling, should not be confused. In these days of a Free Press (at least, in all English - speaking countries) there is no need for a Parliament to express the wants and wishes of the community. "The real Parliamentary Debate goes on of itself, every- where, continually." The Newspaper is an open Forum, in which all opinions can be vented, all grievances stated — from the loss of your umbrella in a railway carriage to the loss of your honour and fortune by unjust Sovereign persons. With regard to the second function of a Parliament, it is evident that in the United Kingdom, the United States, and the British Colonies,—and in other countries to a certain extent,—the Representative Assemblies, by whatever name they may be called, are practically the Sovereign rulers of the respective countries. Now this is precisely the role

they are incapable of playing; actual government should either be by one able man (who will not generally be the eldest-born of any specified family); or failing that, by a Reformed Downing Street, an administration by a select number of really able men—heroically minded, if not heroes. Carlyle's opinion (written thirty-two years ago) seems to be confirmed when we glance at the present condition of the British Parliament. There we see an Assembly of 658 men, talking for half the day during several months of the year, thrashing straw from which newspaper writers everywhere have shaken the last grain, and wasting so much time that almost none of the necessary legislation can be accomplished.

If 658 hens were to assemble for several months annually and practise cackling, I wonder how many broods of chickens good house-wives would be able to reckon up at the close of each season.

Democracy in England and America Carlyle considers as destined to work itself out, and to be followed by a truer government of the Able and Wise Men of each Country. This time may be distant; yet (though a democrat myself) I do not believe that were we ourselves of heroic mind, we should hesitate for one moment to give up our rights of self-government to any true Heavensent Hero King, and to obey him without reserve. "We, for our share, will put away all Flunkyism, Baseness, Unveracity from us; we shall then hope to have Noblenesses and Veracities set over us; never till then."

There are many other points which might be profitably considered, besides those which have been the subject of this rapid notice. Such are his hatred of false sentimentalism; his scorn for those schemes of political economists which assume to be complete gospels for humanity; his position in regard to Pauperism and Labour Questions,—*"He that will not work neither shall he eat."* In all these, and many more may be traced the working out of his' strongest passion: the hatred of all unreality and sham. This ruling passion of his, I am free to admit, led him astray, and that not once or twice merely. If he had proceeded with the cautious step and the gentlemanly manner that some of his critics would like to see adopted in fighting the Devil, he would have made fewer mistakes perhaps, but would have left us quite without those grand lessons which have enriched and may ennoble our age and race. In society he was often misjudged by those who were incapable of comprehending such intense moral force, and was occasionally misunderstood even by friends.

He does not stand alone in this respect. Elijah does not seem to have been particularly popular in the society of his time, and I don't suppose that Socrates, with his searching questions, was altogether a social success at Athens. Yet we honour their memory. I am content, however, to take Leigh Hunt's judgment as to Carlyle's private character and disposition:—

"I believe," he wrote, "that what Mr. Carlyle loves better than his fault-finding, with all its eloquence, is the face of any human creature that looks suffering and loving and sincere; and I believe, further, that if the fellow-creature were suffering only, and neither loving nor sincere, but had come to a pass of agony in this life which put him at the mercies of some good man for some last help and consolation towards his grave, even at the risk of loss to repute, and a sure amount of pain and vexation, that man, if the groan reached him in its forlornness, would be Thomas Carlyle."

Great men are not so plentiful that we can afford to neglect or depreciate them. He who picks holes in the character of a great teacher, and dwells rather on his casual faults than the truer part of him, not only robs himself of one of Heavens brightest gifts, but mutilates it for others.

It would not, indeed, profit us to follow all the recent critics, who in a few short months, on strength of one book written in moments of deepest anguish, have seen fit to demolish our reverence for this great Seer. Many of them found the publication of the Reminiscences a lucky excuse for giving up their adherence to a philosophy they had never really admired, except in so far as it was fashionable to do so. I do not believe it lessened the number of his sincere friends and admirers. His fame stands in no lasting danger from such critics, and it will come back again without our aid—we should but waste time to plead for him whose voice fills half our century.

He once wrote in an album the following trifle:—

*"Simon Brodie had a cow,
He lost his cow, and he couldna find her;
When he had done what man could do,
The cow cam' hame, and her tail behind her."*

We will learn wisdom herefrom, and, sparing unnecessary pains, will leave Carlyle's reputation to take care of itself.

I almost fear, lest under the pretext of a criticism of Carlyle, I shall seem to have preached a sermon largely made up in a piecemeal fashion of quotations from his works, without, moreover, having had the grace to cry "Have patience, good people." My object has been to present you with a view of the principal points in his

teaching, rather than to air any opinions of my own; and consistently keeping this object before me I would entreat your forbearance a little longer, while I read to you on account of its beauty and characteristic feeling, a passage from the Chapter on the Everlasting Yea in Sartor Resartus:—

"Often also could I see the black Tempest marching in anger through the Distance; round some Schreckhorn, as yet grim-blue, would the eddying vapour gather, and there tumultuously eddy, and flow down like a mad witch's hair; till after a space it vanished; and, in the clear sunbeam your Schreckhorn stood smiling grim-white, for the vapour had held snow. How thou fermentest and elaboratest in thy great fermenting-vat and laboratory of an Atmosphere, of a World, O, Nature!—Or what is Nature? Ha! Why do I not name thee God? Art thou not the Living Garment of God? O, Heavens, is it, in very deed, He, then, that ever speaks through thee; that lives and loves in thee; that lives and loves in me?"

"Fore-shadows, call them rather fore-splendours, of that Truth, and beginning of Truths, fell mysteriously over my soul. Sweeter than Day-spring to the Shipwrecked in Nova Zembla; ah, like the mother's voice to her little child that strays bewildered, weeping, in unknown tumults like soft streamings of celestial music to my too exasperated heart, came that Evangel. The Universe is not dead and demoniacal, a charnel-house with spectres, but God-like, and my Father's!"

"With other eyes, too, could I now look upon my fellow man; with an Infinite Love, an Infinite Pity. Poor, wandering, wayward man! Art thou not tried and beaten with stripes, even as I am? Ever, whether thou bear the royal mantle or the beggar's gabardine, art thou not so weary, so heavy-laden, and thy Bed of Rest is but a Grave. O, my Brother, my Brother, why cannot I shelter thee in my bosom, and wipe away all tears from thy eyes! Truly, the din of many-voiced life, which in this solitude, with the mind's organ, I could hear, was no longer a maddening discord, but a melting one; like inarticulate cries, and sobbings of a dumb creature, which in the ear of Heaven are prayers. The poor Earth, with her poor joys, was my needy Mother, not my cruel Step-dame. Man, with his so mad Wants, and so mean Endeavours, had become the dearer to me; and even for his sufferings and his sins, I now first named him Brother. Thus was I standing in the porch of that 'Sanctuary of Sorrow'; by strange, steep ways had I, too, been guided thither, and ere long its sacred gates would open, and the 'Divine Depth of Sorrow' lie disclosed to me."

When we read a passage like this, surely all carping criticism must for a time at least die away, and our minds must turn to that grand sentence in his Rectorial Address at Edinburgh—"There is a nobler ambition than the gaining of all California, or the getting of all the suffrages that are on the planet just now."

To the Problem of Life, Carlyle has given us no easy arithmetical solution—but has he therefore failed? Surely not. If in an unheroic age he has taught us to be heroic; if, through him, we have faith to believe that the Nature of Things at the core of it is good and not chaotic; if we have patience to work, and to wait and hope for those things which as yet we see not (and ourselves may never see); if, keeping Duty steadily in view, we live in obedience to its dictates, construed and interpreted by the aid of our best spiritual and moral instincts, by our conscience and our reason; we shall not have read our Carlyle in vain. Though we cannot solve the problem, we shall have rendered its solution easier to others; though to us there be denied that vision of Truth which none but the pure-eyed see, yet those who come after us will, by our efforts and even by our failures, be able to catch nearer and nearer glimpses of Her face; till Man shall see, in the far good time to come, no longer through a glass darkly, but shall look face to face into Nature, and be transformed by the sight. And as for ourselves, —though in painfully seeking for a road amidst the perplexing paths of Life we lose our way we shall have found what we had sought, and have lost ourselves in the Infinite Soul of the Universe.

And to the Teacher who has given this divine impulse we can show no more grateful reverence than this—to bid him—

*"Stand in his place and testify
To coming ages long,
That truth is stronger than a lie,
And Righteousness than wrong."*

Whitcombe & Tombs, Stationers and Printers, 202, Cashel Street.

I.—What is Education?

"Educit obstetrix, educat nutrix, instituit pædagogus, docet magister."—VARR.

Preliminary.

THE Greek dramatist Sophocles writes: "To know nothing is the happiest life." But however true this may be in the abstract we, in our present artificial modes of existence, need not for practical purposes discuss it: the recognition of education being, under such artificial circumstances, at all events, a necessity. Believing however, as I do, that only the cultured few—as against the unthinking many - have any correct idea as to what education means, or by whom it should be conducted and controlled (thus ignorance the *cause* of error); and also believing, as I do, that *therefore* our public system of education is *radically* erroneous, (thus error the *effect* of ignorance, inasmuch as if we under-stood what education meant, our self-interest would see that *our* money was expended on a proper system); and that, as Diogenes said, the "foundation of every State is its education of its youth," I, *faute de mieux*, have ventured to write the following articles on:—

- EDUCATION.—What it is.
- EDUCATORS.—Who they should be.
- RESULTS OF EDUCATION.—What they should be; and, lastly, on
- EDUCATION BOARDS, School Committees, and State Schools.

In the hope that we may realise how erroneously we have thought and acted in the past, and therefore how desirable amendment is in the immediate future. Indeed my difficulty with regard to our system is not to find a tendon Achilles, but an invulnerable part. Therefore let us enquire:

1. What is Education?

Now to arrive at a clear conception of what it is, let us definitely understand *what it is not*.

(1.) That it is not merely or *mainly* the inculcation, instilling, communicating, or imbibing of knowledge. For "the essence of education is *not* acquirement, but development, expansion, direction, invigoration."

Thus, for instance, the cramming of a pupil for examination is not only not educating him, but literally injuring him by forcing more mental food upon him than he is, for the time being, capable of digesting. Indeed, a medical authority—Dr. Granville, in an article on "Worry," in the *Nineteenth Century* of September, 1881—says: "The pernicious system of 'cram' slays its thousands because uneducated, undeveloped inelastic intellects are burdened and strained with information adroitly deposited in the memory as an expert valet packs a portmanteau with the articles likely to be first wanted on the top." And the same writer further remarks: "The sole remedy is the reversal of a policy which substitutes results for processes, knowledge for education." (And see also Lord Brougham's speeches on education.)

(2.) That it is *not* simply, or indeed *principally*, intellectual development.

So a learned or well-informed man is *not necessarily* an educated man, or a wise man.

Hence the mediæval proverb, "The greatest scholars are not the wisest men;" and the Greek proverb, "How vain is learning unless understanding be united with it." So the author of the *Verbalist*, recently published, says: "Education is one of the most misused of words; a man may be well acquainted with the contents of text books, yet be a person of little education; on the other band, a man may be a person of good education, and yet know little of text books —education is a whole, of which instruction and good breeding are parts."

(3.) That likewise it is *not* only physical training. Otherwise, an athlete would necessarily be an educated person.

(4.) That also it is *not* alone moral culture. For goodness is frequently found where knowledge or physical development, or both, is or are wanting, and—

(5.) That the origin of the word education itself refutes the popular interpretation placed upon it: and suggests not an inculcation of knowledge, *but the reverse*—viz., a leading *out* or forth—*i.e.*, a development of the whole being—physical, mental, moral, *pari passu*. And that not merely a casual development—such as a temporary attendance at a school suggests—but a *continuous* culture (the verb *educare* being frequentative); commencing at conception, and only ending with death. Thus, the celebrated philosopher, Seneca, says:—"We learn not at school, but in life."

Having thus endeavoured to ascertain what it is *not*, let us strive to clearly realise what it *is*.

The Definition.

And in doing this, I cannot use, to explain my views, more apt language than I have employed above, namely, that true education is a *continuous* culture, commencing at conception and only ending with death—of the *whole* being; physical, mental, moral, *pari passu*.

Professor Payne, the first professor of the science and art of education in the College of Preceptors, London, in more technical language, says "education may be described as the systematisation of all the influences which the science of education recognises as capable of being employed by one human being to develop, direct, and maintain vital force in another, with a view to the formation of habits." Whilst Mr. J. 8.

Mill, in his inaugural address, delivered at St. Andrew's, remarked, "whatever helps to shape the human being, to make the individual what he is, or hinder him from being what he is not, is part of his education.

For "the true ideal of education is, to make a man the best, the highest, the wisest, the most comprehensive and communicative, that he is capable of becoming." And thus true education is indispensable to pre-eminent success.

Now my definition of education being a continuous culture of the *whole* being, physical, mental, moral, *pari passu*—is based on the hypothesis that to cultivate solely or unduly the physique, the mind, or the conscience, is to destroy the equilibrium of the vital forces of the man, and hence of the man himself.

Because the subject-being consists only of a certain quantity of vital force, and to develop unduly the physical element, is to expend such vitality on, or exalt athleticism at the expense of, mental and moral development; as much as to immoderately cultivate the mind or conscience is—by exhausting the vitality unduly on it—to injure the physique.

For the physical and the mental are so intimately blended that to expect a strong sound mind or conscience in a slighted or neglected, *and therefore* a weakly or diseased body, is to expect what all the experiences of the natural world—ancient and modern—tell us is contrary to reason. It is unnecessary for me to enlarge on this, so palpable a truism.

Inferences from My Definition.

But the inferences to be drawn from it are so serious that I must ask grave attention to them. Because, if mine be correct, our public system of education requires complete revision and re-organisation. And those I draw are as follow:

(1.) That physical culture—that is the imparting of "strength, dignity, and grace to every movement of the body"—should be *pre-eminent* as the basis of all education. Because corporeal vigour is the first necessary factor in success in everything. For as Sir B. Brodie has said "In order to make the most of the intellectual powers, the animal system should be maintained in a state as nearly as possible approaching perfect health." Hence the saying by a Roman sage "The mind cannot grapple well any task where the body is languid." The Greeks also had a similar proverb showing that they regarded animal vigor as the primary consideration—thus "Health and understanding are the two blessings of life." And the great genius, the Earl of Beaconsfield, probably the wisest and most experienced man of the world of this generation, at all events, says in *Lothair* "The essence of education is the education of the body. Beauty and health are the chief sources of happiness. Man should live in the air; *there* exercises should be regular, varied, scientific. To render his body strong and supple is the first duty of man. He should develop and completely master the whole muscular system."

So that athleticism should, above all things, even for the purposes of thereon building a mental and moral superstructure, form the basis of any system of public education. And this more especially when we remember that not only does the State undertake the education of its subjects for the purpose of obtaining physically strong bodies with, *therefore*, sound minds, capable of the dissection of truth from error, good from evil; but also for the purpose of securing men physically capable for manual labour, and foreign and civil war, and commotion in times of trouble; for competing successfully with other States in times of peace; and with the view of ensuring that both men and women are corporeally and mentally fit to produce the most perfect offspring possible.

It is not necessary to refer to the wisdom of the ancients in this respect, for even now in modern times the Germans—probably the best educated of modern peoples—not only carry out practically the principle in their State schools, but even mark their sense of its importance by designating certain of their higher class State schools "Gymnasien." And even if physical culture were not the necessary factor that it is in education, I cannot refrain from pointing out that muscular exertion is recognised by authorities in physiology as *the* preeminent antidote for mental strain. So that even for such a reason alone—if *as* I say it were *not* the indispensable element which it is in education—it should be scientifically taught in our schools.

(2.) That State mental instruction should be imparted, not *primarily* (as apparently is the case in our system) with the idea of communicating a certain amount of technical knowledge—although this is a valuable *tertiary* consideration—but above everything with the view of training and disciplining the mind to reason and weigh propositions and probabilities. Because the main goal of education is *not* the acquirement of knowledge, but physical development and mental discipline in order to form a capable and competent man. (For, as has been said by a writer on "Popular Fallacies in Education," "Knowledge puffed up, but disciplinary exercise trained up.") For even "the possession of facts is not knowledge correctly speaking. Knowledge is rather a discernment of the relations of facts than the facts themselves, and it is knowledge in this sense only which can form the groundwork of opinion worthy of the name, how the great majority of persons form opinions, which they are quite unable to analyse into their elements. The fact seem to be that the mind has this power, but the operation

goes on unconsciously, a species of unconscious cerebration." Hence the incalculable value of mental discipline.

Further, that such technical knowledge as is imparted should be especially such as places the pupil on the highway of knowledge, giving him indications where he may seek further information, rather than inspiring him with the belief that with his school curriculum ends his education.

(3.) That to avoid our educational system resulting in training scientific footpads, burglars, and swindlers—preyers on society —(which would indeed be "nursing the pinion that impels the steel")—which physical culture combined *only* with intellectual training would tend to create—those moral considerations should be imparted which alone save a learned man from being an intellectual prig. Thus "to train to valour, honesty, prudence, justice—these were the aims of the greatest nations," and should be ours. Or, in other words, "to encourage virtuous inclinations, sentiments, and passions, and to repress those that are evil; to cultivate habits of truthfulness, obedience, industry, temperance, prudence, and respect for the rights of others." Hence the wonderful influence in after-life of the tone of chivalry, honour and fair play inculcated at the great English public schools, such as Rugby, especially in the days of Dr. Arnold. For the inclination of human nature is such that, as Whyte-Melville has cleverly written, "Principle is principle, and honour is honour, so long as circumstances are not too overwhelming, or necessity too urgent." Thus Guizot when Minister of Public Instruction in France said in a circular sent to each public teacher in France that "It is absolutely necessary that popular instruction should not be confined to the development of the intelligence. It should enhance the whole soul; it should awaken the conscience, which ought to be elevated and strengthened according as the intelligence is developed." For as Byron in his Childe Harold says:

*"Whatever creed be taught or land he trod
Man's conscience is the oracle of God."*

(4.) That as the main ends of education should be physical development and mental discipline, and as the younger the child so much greater the susceptibility to impressions which mould his future, so the *most accomplished* teachers should be the teachers of the *junior* scholars because, as Horace says, "With moist clay you may imitate anything you please." Thus "the Jesuits when they found a teacher showing real skill and knowledge in teaching the higher classes, *promoted* him to the charge of the lowest." (And see also Lord Brougham's speeches on the education of the people.)

(5.) That in view of the foregoing propositions teachers should not only possess the requisite technical knowledge (to *superintend* and *direct* the study of their pupils, but *not* to directly communicate knowledge to them), but should understand the art of teaching, and also equally well understand and act according to human nature; in other words, sympathetically realise the nature of the subject person to be educated.

Thus, we might reasonably hope to train our youth to all that constitutes true manhood and womanhood, and thereby—not only arm them but—endow them at maturity, with the most valuable of all wealths—health and wisdom. (For wisdom is wealth, although, as Goldsmith says "She is a coquette, and must be courted with unabating assiduity) Instead of giving them, as now, that mere smattering of technical knowledge—without physical development or mental or moral discipline—which I fear has mainly the effect of supplying them with superficial intellectual food, without supplying them with the power of digesting or utilising it. Thereby simply implanting crude ideas *i* having the tendency principally to excite in them discontent with their lot; instead of affording them the animal power and training of the intellect and conscience which would in all probability secure to them the acquisition by sure methods of the end of all existence—happiness; or, as Lord Macaulay puts it in his essay on Lord Bacon, "the multiplying of human enjoyments and the mitigating of human sufferings." And which implanting *therefore* I fear results in no real benefit to the State or to the subject, Thus let us beware lest "we perish by means of things permitted."

For "one crack in the lantern may let in the wind to blow out the light; one leak unstopped will sink the ship and drown all on board."

Dread of wearying deters me from extending the article, but I hope I have made its main purports to be clear, namely:—

Summary.

(1) That education is a continuous culture—beginning at conception and only ending with death—of the whole being.

(2.) That physical training should be *pre-eminently* the first consideration: and that *discipline* of the intellectual and moral faculties ought to be the next; not the inculcation of technical knowledge. And

(3.) That our system of public education is *radically* erroneous, inasmuch as in addition to other omissions and mistakes relating to inspection, examination in standards, supplying of books and school requisites by teachers, &c., &c.

(a) It altogether omits or neglects to instruct the pupils in the most important lesson of all, namely,—What education is; and especially omits or neglects to impregnate them with the all important idea that it is *continuous* culture only ending with death, and not merely a casual development such as their temporary attendance for a few years at a school suggests.

(b) It altogether omits to treat physical training as *the* main, or even as a main factor in education, and, indeed, ignores it altogether as a portion of the school curriculum[*unclear: lum*] to be carried on under the supervision of the master of the school. The only attempt at its recognition at all in connection with any schools under the control of the Board being in a very subsidiary byeway in the city and suburban schools, where a drill-instructor attends, *and instructs each child one half-hour (!!) a-week*. Thereby occupying in such instruction only a Fiftieth (! ! !) part of the school hours during the week.

For the supplying of the gymnastic apparatuses to a comparatively small number of the schools—even were it to all the schools need not be mentioned; because the exercises are not compulsory, nor ordained to be, nor are they, carried on under scientific supervision: and therefore, except for voluntary recreative purposes, must not be counted on.

Thus, instead of physical training—the all-important factor—occupying the first place in our system, as it should do, it has virtually no recognised position.

(c) It fails largely to recognise the principle that the disciplining of the mind and conscience should be—next to physical culture—the prime consideration, *not* the inculcation of technical knowledge.

This failure is shown especially—

Firstly. In the absence of any test-examination for teachers as to their knowledge of human nature, and their capacity to guide and direct it aright: in order to sympathetically realise, and place themselves in accord with, the natures of their pupils.

And

Secondly. In the employment of, not even qualified junior teachers, but actually pupils only learning to be teachers to teach the most impressible scholars, i.e., the juniors—and so forth.

(d) It promotes the communication of a certain amount of technical knowledge to the first place; and, indeed, *practically*, to the only place, instead of relegating it to the *third* place. And

(e) It provides, as I have remarked above under another heading, that the junior scholars are frequently not even taught by the qualified junior teachers but, by the pupil teachers, instead of considering elementary instruction as the *most important*. And therefore requiring the aid of only the most accomplished and most experienced preceptors.

And the importance of having a clear conception of all this is apparent when we remember that "the greatest wisdom is to know our ignorance; or, as the celebrated orator Quintilian said, "The beginning of excellence is to be free from error;" or more pertinently, as Von Humboldt remarked, "The thing is *not* to let the schools and universities go on in a drowsy and impotent routine; the thing is to raise the culture of the nation even higher and higher by their means,"

II.—Educators. Who They Should be.

"*Le plus difficile, et le plus important de torn les arts, c' est V education.*"—MONTAIGNE.

Preliminary.

As "true eloquence consists in saying all that is proper and nothing more," so here my duty is—what is always a most difficult one—to be explicit, and at the same time brief. For to define accurately, and criticise successfully, it is worse than idle to shield oneself behind generalities which, as a rule, are only a cloak for ignorance, and a door for misconception. (Hence the law maxim, *Fraus latet in generalibus.*) So that, on the one hand, I have to avoid the rocks of Scylla —generalities: whilst on the other hand I must beware lest I fall into the equally dangerous whirlpool, Charybdis—by being unnecessarily prolix.

Before, however, endeavouring to realise who educators should be, our first undertaking seems naturally to consist in clearly understanding what an educator is—in other words, what an educator's mission is.

What an Educator is.

And the best definition I can give is that an educator is "a guide, director, or superintendent of the operations by which" the subject-being is developed.

Now, I have already defined education to be a continuous culture—commencing at *conception* and only ending with death—of the whole being: physical, mental, and moral *pari passu*,

Educators Classified.

Therefore it follows that the first educator, of the subject-being, must be the only one available for the *embryotic* state. The next should be the person who is pre-eminently the most suited for the infantile stage of life. Then, he or she most fitted to develop and instruct more advanced childhood and youth. And finally, the most able teacher for the continuous culture of adult life.

Thus, by analysing the various periods, we arrive at the conclusions that the educator of a being should be—

- *Until birth*, of course the mother.
- *Until infancy be passed*, the mother; or, in exceptional circumstances, the other parent, or a near relative.
- *For advanced childhood and youth*, a parent, or delegate employed by a parent or by the State. And
- *For adult life*, the subject person; himself or herself.

Now, as this article does not purport to be a treatise on embryology or self-culture—because it is written more particularly for the purposes of defining the respective duties, *after* birth of the subject-being, of the parent and the State, and thereby indicating their errors during that period, as prevalent with us.—I do not propose to discuss in detail now either to what a wonderful extent the fœtus may be educated; or consider education during the periods of life beyond early manhood and womanhood. Although by such omissions I waive comment on one at least (*i.e.*, the ante-natal) of the *most* important educational epochs of existence.

So that it must suffice now only to endeavour to define the duties with regard to education.

- Of the parent or guardian *from* birth, and
- Of the State.

Let us, therefore, first direct our attention to the duties of the parent—*i.e.*, the person who by his own action in originating the child by the process of conception is charged with the onus of the complete education of such child.

Duties of Parents.

And here at the outset it is necessary to realise clearly that this duty on the part of the parent is *paramount*. And that the State only interferes, and is only justified in interfering, when the natural [*unclear*: inator] of the child omits or neglects his [*unclear*: o]

Hence arises the only Justification for *free* and *compulsory* education: which in the abstract is wholly indefensible, and only defensible at all on the principle that individual rights must be subjected to the common weal.

Thus let it be remembered the duty of the parent never ends till the subject-being is sufficiently developed and disciplined as to be armed for the battle of life; in other words not merely till puberty be passed but until an age of competent ability, such as early manhood or womanhood, be attained. And ergo that the duty of the State *never* commences until the parent omits or neglects the above-mentioned responsibility naturally devolving upon him. Then, and then only, is the State not only justified, but, in the interests of its subjects, called upon to interfere and insist, if necessary (hence *compulsory* education) on its subject being educated.

Before, however, fully entering upon the questions why and how far the State is justified in interfering with the liberty of its subjects in this matter, and that at the expense of the other of its subjects let us briefly try to understand—what I venture to think is not even faintly understood by the very large majority of parents here, namely—the duties of parents in respect of the education of their offspring.

I especially allude, as I have indicated above, to post-natal influences, and therefore intend only to enter into details in respect of that period; but at the same time I cannot refrain from briefly pointing out, in passing, the strange and almost universal ignorance which appears to prevail amongst parents regarding the obligations they owe to their children *before* birth, which ignorance seems to assume somewhat the following forms, namely:—

(a) That the conception of children is simply a matter of *divertissement* to be entered into wantonly and recklessly, and without the interests of the child, in respect of its physical mental or moral faculties—coming into consideration at all, and without any regard to consequences. Thus, parents do not feel called upon to see that such precautionary measures are taken at the time of conception as would ensure to the life-germ physical vigour, or mental strength and *morate*, [*unclear*: o] to refrain from creating more children than they can

themselves afford to feed, clothe, educate, and launch in life. These are most serious omissions, the latter patent, the former because medical authorities hold that the circumstances immediately surrounding conception have a wonderful influence, in all respects, on all the after-life of the conceived subject.

And the importance of this cannot be overestimated, because not only on the instant of conception taking place is the entire machinery required for the development of the physical and mental organs set in motion—*but life is begun*. Conception therefore must be deemed the basis on which all education is afterwards based. And therefore is as important to the child as a solid foundation is to the superstructure of a building.

(b.) That after conception and prior to birth no efforts need be made to inspire education. But no mistake can be graver: for no post-natal influences can be so direct or potent as those which are ante-natal; when the maternal connection is complete: and when therefore the maternal influence in all respects—physical, mental, moral—is simply all-powerful. For the educatable material is never so plastic as then—to be developed and directed. And the great Napoleon and James I. as regards disposition, and Samson in respect of physical development are quoted as striking instances of this.

Thus, up to the time of birth these serious omissions occur: and thus, so to speak, the child is born seriously handicapped.

But now let us discuss the various stages of educational life *after* birth and the duties of parents respecting them. And firstly of course we speak of

(1). The period *immediately succeeding* birth—the infantile period.

And here it has always appeared to me most serious misconception prevails, inasmuch, as up to the time of apparent consciousness the child is treated as not being educatable—the parents altogether ignoring, at that stage that, as Cicero says, "culture is to the mind what food is to the body." This, however, is a fallacy which must be apparent to any thoughtful person, and I need not therefore further expose it. For, if my argument be sound as to the impressibility of the life-germ, or foetus, a *fortiori* it will apply here.

(2). *Childhood, and Youth*, immediately succeeding infancy. And this period of course extends from the apparently conscious period until the subject—being is deemed to be fully armoured for the battle of life (and if life be a battle what madness it must be not to be armoured for the contest).

And therefore is *the* period which is popularly looked upon as *the* period for Education.

Now, I have so fully defined in my previous article what education is that it is unnecessary for me to go into details here, because all I have there said applies *primarily* to the parent, and *only* to the State in default of the parent doing his duty towards the child.

But I may point out to parents in passing a fact which seems generally overlooked—even in these intensely selfish times—that even apart from natural duty no parent can ever make a better investment for *himself* than the education of his children.

And the reward accrues not only in the proud satisfaction to him in contemplating the gradual development of physique, intelligence, and *morale*—the result of *his* efforts and foresight—but also in the happiness and gratitude of the child. For it is always pre-eminently wise to remember that there is no real happiness in this life except the happiness of making others happy. I shrink from enlarging on this question—the duties of parents—for fear of unduly lengthening this article; and am therefore deterred from indicating the best parental modes of influencing aright the young although I think they are almost unknown, or at all events unpractised, amongst us.

And must, in consequence, content myself instead with simply—in passing—reminding parents of the admirable admonitions of the Roman philosopher Seneca, and the celebrated German Richter, that

"The road by precept is long, by example short and effectual."

And

"For children, there is absolutely no morality, except example, either narrated or seen."

And also of the circumstance that "the tenacity of impressions received in childhood is a fact that should be held most important in every scheme of early education."

Thus we pass now to enquire—

Duties of the State.

(1.) Why the State is justified in interfering at all with the liberty of its subjects in the matter of education; and

(2.) How far its duties, as a State, extend,

And it is especially important that we have clear views on this, because all the problems concerning the

establishment and support by the State of Primary Schools, Universities, and Secondary Schools (including Colleges Grammar and High Schools), and Open Scholarships are soluble only if we form correct conclusions in respect of these two queries, Now, as regards the first query, namely: Why the State is justified in interfering at all. As I have already pointed out, it is clearly *not* justified until the parent omits or neglects his duty, and is then only justified in the interests of the common good. But it *is* then justified (see, however, Lord Brougham's argument and views contra in his speech to the House of Lords on the education of the people) on the ground that the State is a society (*socius*, a friend)—just like a family—whose interest it is that all the members of that society (or family) do the utmost possible for the common good of that society (or family), in order that the society (or family) as a whole may prosper. And as its prosperity largely depends on the ability and inclination of the aggregate of its members, the State (*i.e.* the society) is directly interested to see that its members are so individually trained (or, in other words, educated) as to contribute, by their labour physical, mental, or moral, to the prosperity of the society. It is on only such a principle that—

- The State (*i.e.* the society) is justified in interfering with individual liberty of action (hence *compulsory* education). Or
- Justified in levying contribution on its subject A to educate its subject (hence *free* education).

But the justification ends when the object of endowing the subject with the, power and inclination to make prosper the State (alias the society) and *therefore* himself, is attained. Thus the State is *not* justified either in interfering with liberty, or making its subject A contribute to the education of its subject B, except for the purposes of the prosperity of the State, and therefore not justified in educating B merely for his personal advancement, at the expense of A. Because that is taxing the industry of A for the sole benefit of B, and would therefore not only be unjust, but have the effect of discouraging and ultimately suppressing unaided exertion: and thereby injuring the State: (he prosperity of which—as I mention below is largely dependant on the exertions of its subjects. And, moreover, be injurious to B by undermining that self-reliance which is such an important factor in successful character.

And thus we are brought to the next stage to inquire: How far is it requisite for its own prosperity that the State should see that its subjects are educated?

Now, a State or Government exists only (or the purpose of rendering its subjects happy—because the sole object of all government should be the happiness of the governed. So that its subjects should be educated—

Firstly, To clearly comprehend what will render the State (as a society) happy, and

Secondly, To have the power and inclination to render the State (*i.e.* their society) happy.

To comprehend the former requires physical development, and disciplined intelligence; to obtain the latter, these qualities coupled with a trained conscience.

Therefore, the State is justified in insisting on education thus far, but no farther. So that when the State has ascertained that its subject has been so developed and disciplined

(1.) That he is in a position to clearly comprehend what will render the State (or society) happy, and

(2.) And that he has had the discipline which should ensure the power and inclination to render the State (or society) happy

Then its duty to its subjects, in other words to the aggregate *society*, not only ceases, but is absolutely barred from further action by considerations of unwarrantable interference with the rights of the educatable person, and of its subjects at whose expense the public education is being sustained.

Because the ambition of one subject must not be encouraged by the State at the expense of its subjects, otherwise such encouragement handicaps (*i.e.*, taxes) unaided exertions, and thereby impoverishes the State; inasmuch as the wealth of a State is largely derived from the labour of its subjects, and the greater the wisely directed labour of its subjects the greater (*ceteris paribus*) the wealth of the State (*i.e.*, the society), and, *therefore*, the greater the prosperity of its individual subjects. Consequently, any action on the part of the State (that is, on the part of the society as a whole) that tends to tax and thereby discourage unaided individual labour tends to impoverish the State, because discouraging, and therefore repressing industry; and is also objectionable because, as I remark above, inclining to injure—instead of promoting—that self-reliance which is so indispensable to success.

Thus I hold that Universities and State Secondary Schools—such as Colleges, Grammar Schools and High Schools—and Open Scholarships (*i.e.*, scholarships to pupils other than those educated in the primary schools) ought not to be established or assisted at the public expense; because the requisite power and intelligence that I have spoken of should be easily attainable by the curriculum which should be provided in our primary schools. I do not say that it *is* now so attainable, but that is merely in consequence of the errors of the system on which our primary schools are conducted—the main phases of which I have endeavoured to exhibit in my first article. But with our primary schools conducted as they should be, all that the State requires of its subjects can and ought to be obtained in them without further expenditure of public money.

Here, however, I anticipate an objection that I make no provision for exceptionally clever or deserving

boys, who should be encouraged to persevere for the purpose of becoming brilliant ornaments to the State. In other words, to fulfil the main purport of the ancient Greek code of education—to become brilliant citizens. But the answer to such an argument I conceive as conclusively applicable to our colony, is that such exceptionally clever or deserving boys who have distinguished themselves at the primary schools have the district scholarships (as distinguished from the open scholarships) expressly provided and therefore available for them.

For when living—as here—in a place where no one is clogged or handicapped with hereditary or class privileges or advantages, and where everyone therefore has distinction depending solely on his own merits, and where, therefore, the principle of "the survival of the fittest" has fair play, no boy under such circumstances can complain if he does not achieve all that he desires to accomplish.

Moreover, I cannot—as I mention above—but think that extraneous aid, under such circumstances, is positively pernicious to the boy, because the very struggles requisite to success are the best endowments which a boy can possibly possess when success is secured. In other words, cement his character, and thereby make the boy a *permanent* success. Thus, if my views be correct, the establishment and support at the expense of the State of Universities, Secondary Schools (including Colleges, Grammar and High Schools), and Open Scholarships are unjustifiable—that is, if A receive the advantage of such establishment and support at the expense of B. Do not, however, let me be misunderstood; because, although I deprecate the establishment and support at the ultimate expense of the State of such nurseries of education, I would expressly advocate their establishment and support by the State—an entirely different matter—for reasons which I have not space at the moment to explain.

I am well aware that there is a second ground urged by political economists, as expressed by Professor Fawcett in his work on political economy, viz., "The State must resolutely interfere and boldly assert the great principle that every child shall be protected against the irreparable wrong which is inflicted on him if he is permitted to grow up in ignorance."

But it is unnecessary for me to comment on this as a ground for State interference, as it is fully embraced in the ground) already mentioned by me.

Let me now, therefore, briefly sum up the main gist of this article as follows:—

Summary.

(1.) An educator is "a guide, director, or superintendent of the operations by which" the subject being is developed.

(2.) That the parent's duty—as an educator—is paramount, and commences at *conception*,

(3.) That the State is only justified in interfering—as an educator—when the parent omits or neglects his duty.

(4.) That even then its duty terminates with Primary Schools, because the ends of State education should be therein fully attain-able. And

(5.) That, therefore, Universities, Secondary Schools (including Colleges, Grammar and High Schools), and Open Scholarships ought not to be established or aided at the expense of the State.

We must beware, therefore—with our State educational establishments of Universities, Colleges, Grammar Schools, High Schools, and Open Scholarships—lest our schemes, in the words of the poet Gray,

*Are like the false, illusive light,
Whose flattering, un auspicious blaze
To precipices oft betrays.*

Or, as Bishop Wilson says, as quoted by Mr. Matthew Arnold in his essay on "Culture and Anarchy," "First, never go against the best light you have; secondly, take care that your light be not darkness." For "the man who stumbles twice on the same stone is a fool."

III—Results Of Education: What They Should be.

The difference to be found in the manners and abilities of men, is owing more to their education than to anything else.—LOCKE.

Philosophy of Results.

FOR a philosophy of grave importance there is probably none so little understood—amongst us generally as a people—as the philosophy of results. Gamblers call it luck—pietists providential interposition—the *oi polloi*, fortune and misfortune. But it is the wise man only—whether he be gambler, (pietist, or otherwise—who attributes every result (which word, by the way, has now almost lost its primary meaning of "leaping or bounding back")—be it so-called luck, providential interposition, or fortune—to a natural cause; that is, to accrue (with only (most extreme exceptions, if even such there be) from certain fixed unalterable natural laws, whose workings may be unknown, but whose course and whose mandates nevertheless are as inexorable as the once unknown, and still *apparently* (although only apparently) uncertain doctrine of average, For although Fortuna may be mythically represented as blindfolded, inconstant, and winged, yet the sage know that this is indeed myth, and that she is to be wooed, won, and retained with a certainty far in excess of any material goddess of flesh and blood.

Thus Fielding—whom Byron terms the Homer of human nature—in his "Amelia" says: "To speak a bold truth, I am, after much mature deliberation, inclined to suspect that the public voice hath, in all ages, done much injustice to Fortune, and hath convicted her of many faults, in which she had not the least concern. I question much whether we may not, by rational means, account for the success of knaves, the calamities of fools, with all the miseries in which men of sense sometimes involve themselves by quitting the direction of Prudence, and following the blind guidance of a predominant passion; in short, for all the ordinary phenomena which are imputed to Fortune." And Josh Billings—who employs the guise of quaint folly to attract attention to concentrated essence of wisdom, in the most novel and forcible of garbs—also says, "Thare is no Bitch thing as an aksident: things hav often happened different from what we expekted, but they are part ov a plan we kno nothing about," and "it iz very seldom, if ever, you hear a bizzy man complain ov bad luck."

So with education. Given as premises a person of competent age, and the amount of education that he possesses, and the wise man, whose judgment has been trained to weigh correctly propositions and probabilities (and the more he studies and analyses causes the more correct will he be in foreseeing consequences), can, with as great a certainty as pertains to fallible reason, logically predicate what these premises will result in—that is what fruit such education will bear. And hence what the future of the man will be.

And we are compelled to admit that—in this utilitarian age—results, obtained *per fas out per nefas*, are what are worshipped: however ignorant we may be of the precise processes by which such results are obtained.

Which affords another illustration of Hume's remark that "Ignorance is the mother of devotion," and of Fielding's, in probably one at least if not the most instructive novel in our language (Tom Jones), where he says, "'Men are strongly inclined to worship what they do not understand."

Results of Education.

For the wise man knows that Education

(1.) TO THE SUBJECT—person should secure immunity

- PHYSICALLY—from "Weakness and Disease, except in the comparatively rare instances of hereditary disease and unavoidable accident (if, indeed, such latter contingency exist.)
- MENTALLY—from Error (errare, to wander), and therefore from indiscretion.
- MORALLY—from Selfishness, that root of *all* unhappiness. "For there is no other sin but selfishness; it is the great root of Sin, from which all others branch out." And "the road to happiness is self-denial."

(2.) TO THE PARENT—ought to ensure freedom from Grief (and therefore from all corresponsing unhappiness), for what might otherwise be physical, mental, or moral failures on the part of his offspring, and thus freedom from remorse for any laches on his part which would otherwise accrue from having neglected them.

(3) TO TUB STATE—cannot fail to tend to an avoidance of National Humiliation in time of war or civil commotion; and of Poverty, Disease, and Competitive Inferiority, with other States always; and also of Legislative and Administrative errors, and of that Social and Commercial Licentiousness which are the precursors of decadence. Thus should accrue to

THE EDUCATED PERSON—the acme of desire—*contentment* (the significant meaning of which word, by the way, from *con* and *teneo*—"a state contained within limits"—hence having the desire limited by present enjoyment, is now-a-days virtually lost sight of.) For "the greatest wealth is contentment with a little." In other words, "You have plenty of this world's goods if with your little you have contentment. If you have not contentment, you can never have enough of anything." Nor can I advance a better illustration of my meaning than Goldsmith's village preacher—

"A man he was to all the country dear,
And passing rich with forty pounds a year."

THE PARENT—*satisfaction*—(*satis*—enough —*factum* — being done, thereby indicating a sense of having done enough.)

THE STATE—*prosperity*—(*pro spero*—a condition in accordance with hope.)

Which is, of course, all either the educated person, the parent, or the State can by any possibility desire or expect to obtain in this life under any known conditions.

Its National Consequences.

And which should at least have the following practical visible results to us as a State (or society.)

(1.) That our *National Physical Form and Condition* would be improved; and thereby —not only our mental and moral powers markedly developed and strengthened, but —our labouring, martial, and competitive ability increased; and our procreative virility matured. For "national physique depends upon national health, and health is as necessary to the happiness and prosperity of a nation as it is to an individual —*Salus populi est suprema lex.*"

And this matter of physical vigour, as have already pointed out, should not only always be the pre-eminent aim of education, but should be in our city and its environs, especially so; where, the enervation caused by our warmly-humid, and therefore relaxing atmosphere, is such as tends to sap all energy, and, therefore, all strength of body and mind.

For languor induces feebleness in all respects, and we must all admit the force of the saying of the Roman philosopher, Lucretius, viz, "We feel that the mental powers increase with those of the body, and in like manner, grow feeble with it."

Nor can—with languor-labour hope to successfully utilise the two other main factors in state prosperity—natural agents (that is the agents in the mineral and vegetable worlds which nature affords), and capital—without that vim which physical vigour alone affords.

And, moreover, the national average age and therefore the powers of wealthy—production should thereby be added to, [*unclear: inas-much*] as some scientists consider that it is man's own indiscretions alone which prevent his living now-a-days to at least the age of 120 years. (*Vide* an interesting article on "The Health and Physique of our City Population" in the Nineteenth Century for July, written by Lord Brabazon, for the special object of inducing the London School Board authorities to devote greater attention to the question of improving and promoting the physique of the children assigned to their care.)

(2.) That the *Popular Intelligence* would be disciplined and supplied with, and inclined to increasingly obtain and enjoy, valuable knowledge (for "mind unemployed is mind unenjoyed"), and be thus fortified and clarified, and therefore enabled to act persistently on sound principles—uninfluenced by superficial clap-trap arguments and false issues; and to weigh errors and trifles at their proper value, the crucial test of a well-balanced mind: which would render legislative and administrative mistakes ultimately impossible. And I hope equally rectify amongst others the amusingly erratic views which Mr. Matthew Arnold humorously comments on in his essay on Culture and Anarchy in the following terms (and which views I fancy are not uncommon amongst us): "Why, I have heard people fresh from reading certain articles of the Times on the Registrar-General's returns of marriages and births in this country who would talk of large families in quite a solemn strain, as if they had something beautiful, elevating, and meritorious in them; as if the British Philistine would have only to present himself before the Great Judge with his 12 children, in order to be received among the sheep as a matter of right."

(3) That *State Morale*, which has invariably, from time immemorial, proved the pulse of national prosperity or decay would be elevated in tone (although see "The Education Craze" hereinafter quoted) which would cause fraud and dishonourable dealing to be—if not impossible—at least impracticable, because unprofitable. And which would practically refute the saying of Fielding, "I look upon the two words—Virtue and Religion—to serve only as cloaks, under which hypocrisy may be the better enabled to cheat the world." And prevent any risk from Professor Blackie's pithy foreboding, that "the more knowledge a man possesses without moral culture, the more accomplished a devil he is."

So Rabelais remarks, "Even as arms are weak abroad, if there be not counsel at home; so is that study vain, and counsel unprofitable, which in a due and convenient time, is not by *virtue* executed and put into effect."

And here in passing, although not strictly within my text, I cannot refrain from inviting the student of history to quietly reflect how wonderfully the phases of recent English national life—with its startling contrasts

of extravagant wealth (and therefore luxury) and abject poverty,

(*Tis yours to judge how wide the limits stand Between a splen did and a happy land.*)

its depreciation of martial diplomatic and commercial prestige abroad, (for those who believe in our martial power, let them read two articles, the one on our army in the Nineteenth Century of April, 1881, entitled "The Military Impotence of England," by Captain Kirchhammer, General Staff, Austrian Army, and the other on our navy, in the same review for May, 1881, entitled "The Silver Streak," by Admiral Lord Dunsany), and its trade distress mainly caused by shoddy manufactures at home—coincide with some of those incidents which have always—long before Goldsmith wrote "The Deserted Village"¹—been admitted as amongst the immediate preludes to national decay and ruin. For such phases have indeed lessons fraught with instructions for us, especially when we reflect how few we have amongst us, in our hurry-scurry colonial life, who, like Sir George Grey, quietly retire to seclusion and there in solitude—which is the only safe nursery for wise reflection—unswayed by popular superficiality and feeling, deliberately—as from a pinnacle—mentally view the situation from a broad, unbiassed, and liberal standpoint, and contrast the *status quo* with other similar situations in ancient and modern history. For, I venture to think, it is only such men—who have not only had large practical experience in life, but have leisure quietly to watch, study, think out, and compare—that are fitted to *legislate*. Thus, Plato says "Those commonwealths are happy whose rulers philosophise, and whose philosophers rule."

And no illustration can be more striking of this than the fact which so constantly occurs in our New Zealand legislature, where instead of legislating in accordance with broad and sound principles, the national redress and law-creating court only legislates *for the occasion*—& course which I cannot but believe is wholly unsound, and therefore can only result in troubles and errors,

Probable State Results Detailed.

But *revenons à nos moutons*.

Under such educational auspices

(a) REPRESENTATIVE MEN for public posts would be selected with a due regard for the qualifications needed for such posts, and especially our legislators would, as I indicate above,

(1.) Not only have had large practical experience in life, but be thinkers acquainted with the laws of political economy, *i.e.*, with those principles which the wisdom of ages has shown render a nation prosperous or unhappy—and who have the time to apply those principles to the *status quo* (for as a French moralist has most wisely written, "*Pouvoir sanssavoir est fort dangereux*")

(2.) Who are moreover not financially needy (and therefore not hungry for office, or emolument, thereby minimising in New Zealand politics the applicability of Walpole's maxim that "Every man has his price"), and

(3.) Who also have not failed to manage their own affairs successfully; for society's interests, be it remembered, are only an aggregate of individual interests.

(b) Gaols, Hospitals, Lunatic Asylums, and Orphan and Industrial Homes would be, comparatively speaking, denuded of inmates. (See Lord Brougham's published address to the House of Lords on the Education of the people, and Mr. Bowen's speech on introducing the present Education Act in the New Zealand House of Representatives, although *contra*, read a very quaint and smartly written book containing some very startling facts and figures, entitled "The Education Craze," by D.C.L., published in 1878 by Harrison and Sons, wherein the author *inter alia* says:—"It may, on the contrary, be asserted with truth, that any system of universal and compulsory education must, of necessity, be based upon erroneous assumptions, if it be founded on the belief that crime is inseparable from ignorance," and he quotes "Fact against Fiction," by the Hon. Grantley Berkeley, published in 1874, with facts, figures, and other assertions in support of his view.) For not only would crime be wonderfully reduced in quantity and enormity, but public health would be maintained by a due regard to its primary supports—good food and clothing, fresh air, pure water, exercise, and light, and thereby advances be made towards Dr. B. W. Richardson's Utopia city.

(c) POVERTY—which I conceive to be almostsolely the result of indiscretion—would not only be directly minimised but indirectly discouraged by our realising the *cruelty* and impolicy of persistently collecting for or subscribing to all sorts of case³ of pecuniary distress instead of acting on sound principle) by educating, as I propose; and also by instituting the further precautionary measure of a system of national insurance, such as the Rev. Mr. Blackley's, which to my mind is the soundest proposition in recent times, brought forward for the purposes of national benevolence.

I have no space to enlarge on the subject, which is indeed a wide one, but for those ladies, and other benevolent persons amongst us, who are under the hallucination they are doing good by persistently collecting subscriptions or subscribing for all sorts of cases of pecuniary distress, I would suggest, in passing, to them to read the Rev. Mr. Blackley's treatise, and also an article in Good Words, for March 1882, by the Rev. Brook

Lambert, M.A., entitled, "Some Sins of Almsgiving"; and also the Hon. Mr. Atkinson's speech on 10th July, 1882, on introducing his scheme of national insurance to the General Assembly.

And before leaving the subject I cannot refrain from further mentioning for their consideration, a curious circumstance, of which I am assured by shopkeepers, door keepers, and others in a position to know that the persistent buyers in this city of the petty luxuries of life, such as the first fruits and vegetables of the season, and the patronisers of the drama and of entertainments, and the indulgers in spirituous liquors and tobacco are in by far the largest proportion relatively—the artisan and hand labouring classes. And this is which might be quoted, which convinces me, in respect of poverty, that "there is but little bad luck in the world, but there is a heap of bad management."

(d) BANKRUPTCIES AND COMPOSITIONS with editors—which are really only the product of want of commercial tone—would be reduced to the extremely rare cases of undoubted misfortune —if indeed such a word has any meaning at all—so long as the word indiscretion remains in our language.

And, although being foreign to my subject, it is impracticable for me to now pursue it I cannot refrain—in passing—from suggesting to those interested in it, to read thoughtfully Lord Sherborne's (the late Mr. Robert Lowe's) able article on "What shall we do with our Bankrupts," in the Nineteenth Century for August, 1881—wherein he advocates the abolition of all bankruptcy laws—and I also venture to mention to those interested, that possibly some aspects new to them may be found in an article I wrote for the Observer of the 29th January, 1881, entitled, "Bankruptcy; Considered as one of the Fine Arts."

(e) SOCIAL INTERCOURSE would not then hear the reproach of Punch where, in writing on civilisation, it is said, "The philosophy of this age is peculiarly the philosophy of out-sides." Because shams would receive a fatal blow at the hands of realities; and

(f) ART, SCIENCE, AND LITERATURE would, with increased enlightenment, be increasingly encouraged and promoted, and would in their turn exercise a mellowing tendency; yielding that refinement, subtlety, and ecstasy of pleasure which are only known to their intense votaries (*Ingenuas didicisse fideliter artes emollit mores, nec sinit esse feros*).

Thus would the commonwealth be advanced in vigour and virtue, and thus might we hope to realise the pre-eminent wisdom of the maxim—

"Il faut se faire valoir,"
and
"That goodness is no name,
And happiness no dream."

R. LAISHLEY, junr.

NOTE.—I have not had space to discuss, in my three articles, many questions relating to the subject of great interest and importance, especially as to whether the State is justified, at the public expense, in establishing and supporting technical schools, to teach the arts and industries, the science, and the practical works and duties of life, or what would be the result to the State, if it did so. But, for those interested in the subject, I would refer them, amongst other authorities, to J. G. Thorold Roger's Essays on National and Technical Education; to Professor Laurie's work published this year on the training of teachers; to Professor Huxley's public addresses; to an interesting article in Demorest's Magazine for last February on "The Relation of the Teacher to the future of Education;" and to "The Education Craze," above quoted.

Nor can I refrain from especially referring those concerned in infant and adult education to (in addition to works already quoted) Dr. Temple's Essay (the first one of the celebrated Essays and Reviews), the celebrated German philosopher, J. P. F. Richter's "Levana;" to the equally celebrated English philosopher J. S. Mill's remarks on the same subject in his work on Political Economy; and to Professor O. S. Fowler's "Science of Life."

IV.—Boards, School Committees, and State Schools.

Begin, be bold, and venture to be wise;

*He who defers the work from day to day,
Does on a river's bank expecting stay.
Till the whole stream, which stopped him, should be gone,
That runs, and as it runs, for ever will run on!*

—COWLEY'S translation of HORACE.

The Sovereignty of Wisdom.

NOTWITHSTANDING the homage almost universally paid to imperialism, royalty, aristocracy, hereditary honours, and wealth, and notwithstanding the fallacious saying, "It's good to be wise but better to be rich," reflection must convince us that the only human superiority in this world—with its vexed problem "Is life worth living," under the most favourable auspices—that we should own is wisdom [although Horace says even "Wisdom at proper times is well forgot"]; and that the only sound political platform is that expressed in the famous Declaration of Independence—which has always appeared to me the grandest pronouncement on record of public liberty:—"We hold these truths to be self-evident: *that cut men are created equal* (the italics are mine); that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their first powers *from the consent of the governed* (the italics are mine); and that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundations on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness, &c."

And as it is on these principles—that is the exaltation of wisdom and equality—our New Zealand constitution is based, and our educational system is founded, it is necessary before we specifically discuss the subject of the present article that we clearly realise the *general* rights and duties of the people of this colony in respect thereof, and especially that the public education of our children is initiated, controlled, and conducted solely by *us* the people, for the sole benefit of us, the people; and that, therefore, we are directly and immediately responsible for, and benefit or suffer by its efficiency or inefficiency.

Self-Government.

In other words that it is *not* the Legislature that creates or formulates the system of State education, nor is it Boards, School Committees, or teachers who control, conduct, or are responsible for it; but we, solely, the people, directly and immediately, ourselves. *They* being all merely instruments or conduit pipes, *i.e.*, *we* being the heads that counsel [and as the Greeks proverbially said, "Counsel is a Divine thine" they, merely the arms that strike, carrying out our will.

And that therefore it is idle for us to complain of legislative or administrative grievances in the system, because that is merely complaining of our own conduct—the prevention of and the remedy for which are held by us in our own hands. Thus, if such grievances exist—it is not merely Prudence, which only directs what is to come, but Wisdom—which directs all matters present and to come—alone can rectify them, as we—and we only, the people of this colony, in respect of this colony—and Minerva in our own sole keeping and, the fore, we and we only are responsible if the goddess does not control our counsels and govern our conduct. Thus the learned Bishop Stilling fleet wrote: "Two things speak much the wisdom of a nation; good laws, and a prudent management of them." But in order to thoroughly understand what, this means we must more lucidly (and our great want according to Mr. Matthew Arnold is lucidity) and persistently recognise than we now do, the all-important ego factor in our educational life; that is the keen realisation of personal advantage to each of us in its efficient conduct. In other words, that we *individually and directly* are *substantially and proportionately* benefitted or injured in our persons and property—as I have fully detailed in my last article—by well or ill-conducted State education. Thus the non-exercise of wisdom in the election of representatives for the House of Representatives and therefore for the Legislative Council, for it is virtually an elected body depending for new members on the House of Representatives) and for Education Boards, and School Committees,

(1) *Directly injures us* each in our persons and property, by fostering or allowing the growth of physical weakness and disease (for as the Latin epigrammist, Martial, says "Life is not to live, but to be well"), mental error, and selfishness, and

(2) *Indirectly harms us*—

(a) By destroying confidence in our qualifications to govern; (because a prerequisite to obtain or retain the

power to rule is to inspire confidence of competence to rule), and therefore, by acting as a precursor of, at least a temporary, loss or curtailment of our governing powers. Thus, that distinguished statesman and political writer, Viscount Bolingbroke, writes in his celebrated letters, "We do not read, I think, of more than one nation who refused liberty when it was offered to them; but we read of many, and have almost seen some, who lost it through their own fault, by the plain and necessary consequences of their own conduct, when they were in full possession of it, and had the means of securing it effectually in their power."

(b) By dealing a blow at, and thereby retarding, the great principle of the government of ourselves by ourselves: which principle should, in the interests of humanity generally, be dear to, and protected by, all of us; and which—although it must ultimately prevail (*magna est Veritas et praevalabit*) is thus temporarily retarded by human frailty. For we should be especially on Our guard not to afford to the enemies of liberty any practical illustration of the sentiments to which De Tocqueville gives expression in his celebrated work on Democracy, where he says—Aristocracies are infinitely more expert in the science of legislation than democracies can ever be."

Thus, indiscretion in the choice of representatives means not only the individual and direct injury to us personally, that I have pointed out, but also indirect damage to us and others by playing into the hands of centralism—the vice-regent of autocracy here, and therefore—the pronounced foe to that most-to-be-cherished of political birthrights—self government, i.e., the sovereignty of the people. And it is quite irrelevant—in view of the constitutional powers vested in us—to reply that such powers are nominal rather than real.

Because it is not so. Their exercise, just as we may from time to time wish, being merely a question of will—the wondrous influence of which appears to me almost universally unrecognised, but the real and overwhelming potency of which is truly and grandly expressed by Ella Wheeler as follows:—

*There is no chance, no destiny, no fate
Can circumvent, or hinder, or control
The firm resolve of a determined soul;
Gifts count for nothing—Will alone is great;
All things bow down before it soon or late.
What obstacle can stay the mighty force
Of the sea-seeking river in its course,
Or cause the ascending orb of day to wait?
Each well-born soul can win what it deserves.
Let the fool prate of luck; the fortunate
Is he whose earnest purpose never swerves—
Whose slightest action or inaction serves
The one great aim. Why, even Death stands still,
And waits an hour sometimes for such a will.*

With these premisses—and with the warning of Sir George Grey, as expressed last year in our General Assembly, ringing in Our ears at elections of Educational representatives "That it requires some hard fighting to win a real battle," and moreover remembering as Whyte-Melville says "Opportunity is the harvest of the Gods"—let us enquire what are our individual and direct interests, and *therefore* what are our duties in electing Educational Boards and School Committees to control and conduct—what I have endeavoured to demonstrate in my preceding articles to be, and what Montaigne, amongst many others, designates (as I have already quoted) as—"the most difficult and the most important of all the arts." And the most important not only for the reasons I have already given in my preceding articles but also for this reason, as I think—although I have no space to dilate on it—that education as contrasted with many other arts, such as that of the clergyman, the physician, or the advocate, is essentially preventive rather than remedial; and is, therefore, as superior in importance to them as to prevent a catastrophe is to remedying it. Moreover, the *exact status ante quo* can never be regained.

Boards.

"Be a firlen' to yoursel' and sae will ithers."

Now there are two considerations which should engage, as I think, our attention as affecting the choice of candidates for membership of a Board of Education, and

(1.) The first is that a representative—whether he be elected to an Education Board, School Committee, or House of Representatives, is *not* a delegate, or a deputy, or an ambassador as if to a Congress, but "a

professional agent," empowered (according to Mr. J. S. Mill, on Representative Government, whose views on the qualifications of representatives generally I adopt) not only to act for his constituents but to judge for them what ought to be done; and that "in this" (referring specially to Britain, but of course equally applicable here), and moat other countries which possess representative government, law, and custom, warrant a member of Parliament," (and of course Boards and School Committees are simply Parliaments in miniature), "in voting according to his opinion of right, however different from that of his constituents." That paragraph of course only refers to where pledges have not been exacted, in which case he becomes a trustee only in respect of such pledges, and is bound to carry them out or resign his trust. But, in the absence of pledges, the position is this: That the electors accept the elected as their choice—relying on *his* wisdom—to act for them, as *he* may think best in their interests,—irrespective of *their* own judgment—on all matters that arise, and content to accept *his* judgment and actions as their own.

And, therefore, a representative frequently acts—and is quite justified in so doing—in direct contravention of what he knows to be the opinions or wishes of his constituents.

Indeed, where no pledges exist, to act wisely for the public good, irrespective of temporary popular clamour and ignorance, exhibits an invaluable wisdom, distinctly beneficial, not only to the public, and therefore to the representative as one of them, but also ultimately to the representative.

For no mistake can be graver, even for the representative personally, although it is not infrequent, than to sacrifice personal honour, which includes personal judgment (for one can not act contrary to one's convictions without being dishonest), for the sake of temporarily pandering to public feeling and popular mistakes. And he who does so embraces the words of Caius Marcus in "Coriolanus," and "swims with fins of lead, and hews down oaks with rushes." Because political wisdom, which means consistent honesty of purpose coupled with persistently sound judgment, is the surest road to ultimate pre-eminent political success.

Thus to use again the words of the great philosopher, and which I adopt as my first and main canon on the subject, *the election ought to be unremitting in their search for a representative of such calibre as to em-trusted with full power of obeying the [unclear: dictates] of his own judgment.*"

(2.) And the second—although really in eluded in the first—is that in judging what character of person (I do not say man, because women are also by the Education Act made eligible as holders of the office) should be elected to any post, the first question must be to inquire what are the duties of the port and therefore what should be the qualifications of the electee. Because a person may be, of course, a very competent representative for one office hut equally incompetent for another. And thus to elect irrespective of special qualification for the post would be as rational as to employ a surgeon to conduct the advocacy of a cause or an advocate to perform a surgical operation. And yet, such a solecism, I fear, we—in choosing representatives—very frequently adopt, and thereby not only bring representative institutions into great contempt and damage to the interests entrusted to such representatives—and *therefore* to us individually—in the respects I have already indicated.

Now the whole control and supervision of the public school system are (with the exception only I mention hereafter under the head of School Committees) virtually vested in the Boards (*vide* 35th section of the Education Act, 1877), and they are therefore virtually administratively omnipotent in their respective districts.

And thus the whole competent or incompetent public training of our children is rested in them.

And with them, therefore, lie, not only what are probably the two greatest requisites for State educational perfection, via.,

The selection of competent teachers and

The appointment of able inspectors,

but also all other subsidiary matters, without which even the appointment and selection of competent and able teachers and inspectors are vain, namely, to provide suit-file books and buildings, the best possible *tit/urn* of school duties, proper regulations for examinations and inspections, and for the training of teachers, and that general practical administration of school affairs which alone can ensure efficiency and harmony in the whole system. Thus, all these duties are especially the function of a Board, and unless the members of such a Board are qualified to efficiently perform these duties, one of two events must inevitably happen.

(a) Either—if competent teachers and able inspectors have been appointed—the whole administrative power must practically float to and become vested in them; making them practically, and the Board only nominally, the State educational machine, with the self-interest risk (including sordidity and love of ease)—with inevitable injury to the system—necessarily asserting itself.

(b) Or, if the teachers be not competent, or the inspectors not able, then the whole system must degenerate in tone (and therefore in efficiency) down to the level of the educational views and capacities of the Board. It was probably with views somewhat akin to these that the Hon. Mr. Bowen when introducing the present Act into our General Assembly said: "It is important that men working on these Boards should be men who are known to have taken an interest in popular education, and to have spent time in studying it;" and Professor Huxley, when standing for election at the London School Board in 1870, wrote an article in the Contemporary

Review on "The School Boards: what they can do, and what they may do," which contains several valuable suggestions on Boards, and, *par parenthèse*, I may mention, sets physical training and drill as the primary kind of instruction to be attended to.

Now for a Board to be competent to select fit teachers and inspectors, decide on suitable books and buildings, and the best possible *régime* of school duties, on proper regulations for examinations, inspections, and for the training of teachers, and practically administer school affairs generally, three special educational qualifications seem, to me, indispensable, viz.:

(1.) Thorough knowledge of what education is—that is of the end to be attained by a public curriculum of training.

For how can one reasonably hope to attain an end if one does not know what end he is striving to attain.

(2.) Which is an entirely different thing—the knowledge of how best that end is to be attained. For one may thoroughly understand theoretically what education is, and yet be entirely unacquainted with either what lessons the experience of the past affords, or be able to judge whether a suggestion—not found in the annals of experience—be practically wise or not, or to decide on technical situations and problems which must inevitably and constantly arise.

Let me illustrate what, by this latter sentence, I mean. The primary schools, which are especially the charge of Education Boards, teach six standards of knowledge, and the subjects specified in the 84th section of the Education Act of 1877; and therefore, of course, teachers and inspectors are appointed, books provided, *régime* of school duties, examinations, inspection and training of teachers regulated with this in view. Now how is it possible for the members of a Board—unless they are content to throw themselves completely into the hands of the technical officers of the Board and accept *their* dicta, which thereby become mandates,—to be judges of the competency of a teacher to teach the six standards, or an examiner to examine, or an inspector to inspect in them; or of the fitness or superiority of books proposed to be chosen, or of the goodness of a proposed *régime* of school duties, or of regulations for examinations, inspections, and for pay of teachers, or of the technical results of examinations and inspections—all to be applicable, mark you, to one or other of the six standards—unless the members of the Board have at least that amount of technical knowledge, which will enable them so to judge. The situation otherwise seems to me quite incongruous; and I regret I have not more space to demonstrate its anomaly by more detailed, and therefore more startling, illustrations.

But I am forced to pass on to the third special qualification.

(3.) Which is also a distinct faculty from the last—viz., the ability to practically apply the aforementioned knowledge. For persons, as I fully showed in my first article, are not necessarily wise because they are theoretically learned or well informed, or, as Goldsmith expresses it in his essay on "The present state of polite learning," we grow learned, not wise by too long a continuance at college; or, as another writer has artistically expressed it, "Knowledge is not wisdom; wisdom, it is only the raw material from which the beautiful fabric of wisdom is produced. Each one, therefore, should not spend his days in gathering gaining materials, and so live and die without a shelter." Therefore, the special educational requisites for a member of a Board of Education should be twofold—

- *Technical Educational Knowledge*, and
- *Practical Ability*—

An indispensable compound, which I designate as *Educational Wisdom*.

But, possibly, I hear an objection to all this, to the effect, "Your theories are all very well as theories, but they are Utopian—they are not practical, because we can't obtain such representatives as you suggest." I should greatly grieve to hear such an objection, because it can really in effect mean this, and this only—"It is quite true we claim to govern ourselves, and should be greatly aggrieved if the right were not conceded to us, but we are, practically, not able to efficiently do so." Which is a practical surrender to centralism of educational rights, because a practical confession of inability to rule; which confession of inability—as I have above-stated—can only be a precursor of at least a temporary loss of ruling power until we, the people—who are inherently entitled to it—are sufficiently educated to appreciate it, and efficiently exercise it. And, moreover—as I have already pointed out—works injustice towards the vindication of the great principle of self-government, and *therefor*, to humanity, Or, if it did not result in a temporary loss of ruling power would mean a *régime* which could only tend to national decadence not to national advancement. For rest assured in national life as in natural life (because the former consists of the latter) a stationary attitude whilst others advance is equivalent to decadence.

Moreover there is no ground for any such objection because we have amongst us men thoroughly competent to be members—such as I describe—but, I fear, we, following the tendencies common to all democratic communities, do not seek to elect them for reasons which I have not here opportunity to give.

Thus an educational representative at a Board of Education should possess

- General Calibre, which includes the requisites for representatives mentioned in my last article, and
- Special Educational Wisdom, such as I have above described.

Let me therefore press upon the electers—"Know what you want; know it for a certainty, and without misgivings or doubts; then possess yourself of the patience for biding your time to secure it," because "on all occasions the beginning should look forward to the end." And seeing that education "is the most difficult and the most important of all the arts, surely it follows that it should be controlled and conducted only by ablest men.

I sincerely trust I have made myself so clear that I may be permitted without egotism to apply—to what I have written on this head—the words of the immortal Junius, "A writer who founds his arguments upon facts such as these is not easily to be confuted He is not to be answered by general assertions or general reproaches. He may want eloquence to answer or persuade, but speaking truth, he must always convince."

School Committees.

"Do the likeliest, and God will do the best."

Now, School Committees—as I, when a member of a Committee, publicly ventured to assert, and as I again, when no longer a Committeeman but a member of a Board, unhesitatingly venture again to assert—are not only, as the Hon. Mr. Bowen admitted when passing the Act through the General Assembly, valuable: inasmuch as they keep up public interest, and keep local wants in view; but are invaluable as directly representing the principle of local self-government in the respective districts, and, moreover, are bodies superior in educational importance and power, and therefore in educational influence, to Boards.

Because Boards solely derive their existence from them, and the members of the Boards are dependent for their existence, as members, on the Committees. So that the Committees can not only elect whom they please to the Boards—pledged to carry out whatever educational policy or details they (the committees) wish but have the power practically to remove members from time to time of whose policy or of whose actions they disapprove. (For further details of the relative positions of Committees and Boards I venture to refer those interested to an address of mine published in the HERALD of the 29th January, 1881, and to a leader which appeared in the Star of the 1st February, 1881).

Thus, as the direct representatives of the householders, they are the special instruments of educational self-government; and to use the words of the Hon. Mr. Chamberlain, uttered at Birmingham last year, "Local government is not merely the great instrument for promoting the comfort and the happiness of the people, but it is also the political education of the nation."

In addition to

- Electing Board members, their main duties are
- The appointment, suspension, and dismissal of teachers—for, as I contend, the powers, except in extreme cases, are intended by the Act to be vested in them, and are vested in them, and
- The charge of the school buildings: which last mentioned duty vests in them the large power of closing a school; even in spite of a Board.

I am very pressed for space, but as applicable to the much-debated 45th section of the Act I cannot refrain from again quoting from Professor Huxley's article, where he says:—"I suppose no one will dispute the proposition that the prime duty of every member of such Board is to endeavour to administer the Act honestly, or in accordance not only with its letter but with its spirit. And if so, it would seem that the first step towards this very desirable end is to obtain a clear notion of what that letter signifies and what that spirit implies. So that his idea is, and, as I think, the only reasonable one, that the Act should be administered not only in accordance with its letter, but with its spirit, and that to administer it otherwise is to administer it dishonestly. With this idea kept in view—even if one had not read the debates in our Legislature on the Bill, before it became law, and the other sections of the Act—I cannot think that any impartial mind can come to any conclusion but that the confidential trusting word "consulted" in respect of an appointment, suspension, or dismissal of a teacher, means, and can only mean—

- That the local School Committee should be not merely communicated with—for if such were the intention of the Legislature the more formal words "communicated with" would have been used—but taken into the confidence of the Board; in other words, have all the data, in the possession of the Board, laid before them in order to guide them in forming an opinion, and
- Have their opinion, advice, or recommendations carried out, unless there be very substantial reasons to the contrary.

And the very substantial reasons to which I allude which would alone justify the Board in ignoring or exercising their veto power, and thereby overriding the local Committee, I believe can only be classed under one of two heads.

(a) Either when data have come into possession of the Board subsequently to the reference to the Committee, in which case the proper course, I apprehend, would be to refer the matter back with the additional

data to the Committee for further consideration.

(b) Or when the local Committee have shockingly erred, as for instance, if such instance be possible, where they might recommend the appointment or retention of an unquestionably immoral character, or a grossly incompetent teacher. And not even in the latter case, unless the Board can possibly supply a more competent one. Because I am satisfied that it is quite possible that a teacher may have passed our highest grade of teachers' examinations, and yet be incompetent—for reasons which I have not space here to explain. Thus do I construe the powers of School Committees in respect of teachers; and in view of the approaching elections let householders and Committees remember the words of Cassius:—

*"Men at some time are masters of their fate;
The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars,
But in ourselves, that we are underlings."*

These being the most important duties of School Committees, the householders should be most careful to elect from amongst their number as School Committeemen, only such as attain or most nearly attain the qualifications I have sketched for members of a Board; which qualifications, as I have already mentioned under the head of "General Intelligence," include the courteous recognition of the rights of Committees, and *therefore* the recognition and value of local school government by householders in the respective districts.

I say *most nearly* attain because I am aware in sparsely settled districts the choice is generally limited. But of course if we cannot attain perfection the next best thing we can do—and that is always practicable—to approach it as nearly as possible. And then, to use the words employed in an article in McMillan's Magazine for October, 1880, entitled "Schools in Florence," "It may be anticipated that a carefully-chosen body of local managers will ultimately be called in to take a more responsible share of the local work in connection with the schools than they do now."

For, as I have already stated, a necessary step towards obtaining increased power is to inspire confidence in capacity to exercise increased power.

State Schools.

"Forsan et haec olim meminisse juvabit."—Virg.

My space is gone, and even were it not I am afraid of wearying, and therefore can go into no details, except briefly to indicate what appears to me as amongst the main defects in the practical working of our public schools, viz.:—

- That education is not practically recognised therein—as fully detailed in my first article. And since writing it I have lighted on a paragraph quoted from the "Times," which markedly corroborates the conclusion I then expressed—viz., "The public elementary scholar now emerges from the six standards, a mere useless pedant, his head filled with worthless stuff, and without either the will or the power to turn it to account."
- That the minimum school age should be 7 not 5, because earlier school tuition is not only physically hurtful, but mentally injurious.
- That in respect of teachers there is not only no sufficient test examination of their competency: but that not even qualified junior teachers, but actually pupils only learning to be teachers are employed to teach the most impressible scholars—i.e. the juniors—as I also in my first article pointed out.
- That the visiting examiners in standards should be periodically changed: to prevent examinations constantly in the same groove; and prejudices for or against any particular teacher.
- That there has been no universal examination of scholars, but only of a few selected at the caprice of teachers, which is not only a grave injustice to the un-examined children and precludes the Board and the public in forming even any such conclusions as examinations afford on the efficiency of scholars and teachers, but creates public delusion and thereby public detriment.
- That there is no systematic inspection of the schools—in this district at all events—some schools remaining uninspected for years—a *most serious* omission, as I think. For remember the real state of a school can only be judged, not by the annual standard examinations, but by inspection.
- That large classes, such as 70 to 80 in a class, as at Wellesley-street School, are tolerated, rendering tuition of individual scholars a farce.
- And that school *materiel* is not supplied by Boards, but by teachers, which is wrong; for the reasons I have already fully publicly expressed.

These are grave defects, which, I conceive, require immediate correction; and then, and then only, may we

hope that State schools will fulfil their mission; which I have already elaborately explained, and which—as far as the intellect is concerned—Mr. J. S. Mill, in his work of Political Economy, expresses to be as follows:—

"It may be asserted without scruple that the aim of all intellectual training for the mass of the people should be to cultivate common sense; to qualify them for forming a sound practical judgment of the circumstances by which they are surrounded."

General Conclusion.

"The dreaming soul is on the way of death
The harvest soon is o'er
Rouse up, and dream no more!
Act, for the *summer* fadeth like a breath—"

Thus I have endeavoured to contrast education as it should be, and as it is here; and have attempted not only to diagnose the disease, but to prescribe the remedy. The issue is in the hands of you, the electors. Or to apply the figurative words of Junius (referring to Lord Mansfield), "I have bound the victim and dragged him to the altar," and reminded you, the electors, that you have all the powers of a sacrificing priest.

Therefore, again using the words of Junius, and especially in view of the approaching elections, "If, when the opportunity presents itself, you neglect to do your duty to yourselves and to posterity, to God, and to your country, I shall have had one consolation left," that I have not refrained from boldly warning you of your obligations, and, in default, of your fates: whilst at the same time purposely avoiding all vexed religious questions, including those which Square, the philosopher, and Thwackum, the divine, discussed, such as "Can any morality exist independently of religion?"

Of course I fully expect that there will be those who will endeavour to mislead you by sneering at my reasonings as fallacious, and at my conclusions as Utopian: but for that I care nothing; because I am satisfied "that there is a fund of good sense in this country which cannot long be deceived by the arts either of false reasoning or false patriotism."

The Public Debt of Australasia A Paper Read before the Royal Colonial Institute 21st November 1882
By Sir Francis Dillon Bell, K.C.M.G. Agent-General for New Zealand His Grace the Duke of Manchester, K.P. in The Chair *Reprinted, by permission, from the Journals of the Institute Sixpence*
London Spottiswoode & Co., Printers New-Street Square 1882

The Public Debt of Australasia.

THE subject I have chosen for to-night is not one, I fear, which you will think lively or entertaining, dealing as it does with dry figures; hut it is one of consequence to yourselves as well as to us colonists, and I made choice of it for the following reason.

Since I came over to England about eighteen months ago, I have watched with care what has seemed to me a growing anxiety on the subject of the Public Debt of Australia and New Zealand, So far, however, from being vexed at this, I have welcomed it; because the very existence of such a feeling must lead those to whom we owe so great a sum of money, to look more closely than they have done into our power to pay. Nothing will give the colonists a greater pleasure, than for the financiers of this great city to examine our position and our resources with critical care; and the more thoroughly they do it, the more satisfied we shall be.

It is only of late years that the growing wants of the many settlements which England has founded on the other side of the world, have led to the rapid accumulation of debt which has taken place; and it was, perhaps, quite natural that the frequency with which we have been coming to London for Government loans, should excite some fear that we were borrowing beyond our means. I hope that what I am about to say to-night, may help to a fair judgment of whether there really is good ground for any alarm.

I have chosen to group together, for my present purpose, all Australia and New Zealand, because I think (if such a remark does not sound like an impertinence from one who is not himself a member) that it is the especial province of the Royal Colonial Institute to examine such a question as the one I am bringing before you, in no narrow or provincial spirit, but from a national point of view. It is true that the public debt of each colony, and a comparison of the debt of each with its separate resources, would be an interesting enquiry. Their relative indebtedness and power to pay vary widely; and I feel that I may even be open to the imputation, that it is because New Zealand has the heaviest debt of all, that I am taking them all together and concealing her relative

weakness to bear her debt as compared with the better power of her sister colonies. This is the last thing I should wish to do: yet I could not go into the New Zealand debt separately, without referring to her peculiar position; for instance, our native troubles have cost us nearly 6 millions, which in proportion to population is more for us there than 400 millions would be in England. But to do this would be to change the object of this paper. What I really want to do is to look at all the southern colonies together, and so to inspire, if I can, a better appreciation of their united financial strength. For our debt has increased more than nine fold in the last twenty years, and it now amounts, after deducting accrued sinking funds, to rather more than 96 millions: of which about 84 millions are held in England, and 12 millions on the other side. The question of our solvency, therefore, is of as much consequence to you as it is to us.

Before going any further, let me ask you to consider for a moment the inevitable conditions which have led to this indebtedness. Fifty years ago the colonies of Victoria, South Australia, Queensland, and New Zealand did not exist. A narrow fringe along the coast of New South Wales alone was sparsely settled. Step by step the adventurous pioneer took up country for pastoral pursuits, and waited for the wave of settlement to come up after him. When the point was reached where the cost of bringing produce to the nearest harbour became prohibitive, we had either to build railways or cease any further colonisation. A curious calculation was made by the late Justice Chapman, whose name is familiar to all Victorians and New Zealanders. He examined what it cost the population of a certain district in Victoria, a mere handful in number, for the carriage of their goods to and from Melbourne by drays; he proved that they were paying £700,000 a year for transport; and he showed that if this handful of settlers were to undertake the whole burden of the interest on a loan for a railway, without allowing for a single new passenger or a single ton more goods, they would not only pay that interest, but make a saving of hundreds of thousands every year. The freight of Hour from Melbourne to the Bendigo gold-field was at that time £140 a ton; it is now 140 pence; and the building of a single line has, in transport alone, saved the people who are settled by its side, not thousands but millions.

But if we ever were to have a railway system into the interior of each colony, it was evident that we must come to the great money centre of the world for the means of doing it. You lent us all the money we asked for that purpose. But as fast as we built railways, other wants sprang up. The population increased more rapidly than the country was opened up. The more money was spent on our railways, the more was wanted for roads and bridges at their side: the people demanded their post offices, their telegraphs, their courts of justice, their hospitals, their schools, and they insisted on having these all at once. We not only had to come to you for more and more, but every Government on the other side of the world had a hard task to keep pace with the progress and the impatience of the people,

The same question that presented itself then, presents itself to-day. The colonists will suffer no barrier to stop them from going on to conquer the wilderness. We must perforce fulfil the law of our existence, and to fulfil it we must have money. So we come to you more frequently, and for larger sums; but in doing so we recognise your right to ask what we have to show for the money you have already lent us, and what is our real power to repay it.

It is in the hope that I may satisfy you on this, that I am speaking to you to-night.

I have already said that our public debt is rather more than 96 millions. The following is the distribution of the total, giving the net amount owing by each colony after deducting accrued Sinking Funds:—

Of course, the first question that arises in regard to such an amount of debt is how many people there are to bear it. Now, our population is, in round numbers, according to the latest returns:—

We therefore are even now nearly three millions of people, and more than a million of these have been added in the last 10 years.

Now in 1860 we owed only 10 millions. We have added 86 millions in the last 20 years. I willingly allow that this is a very great and sudden growth of debt in so short a time. The real question is, has the progress of Australasia been equal to the growth of her debt? And the answer to this is, that it has been greater in many ways.

Out of the 96 millions borrowed by us, we have spent more than 56 millions on railways, 20 millions on other public works, and nearly 10 millions on immigration.

In the first place, therefore, I must point this out: If you take the railways, immigration, and telegraphs, these three alone comprise nearly 70 millions of the debt. I shall presently show you that our railways are even now yielding a net return all but equal to the interest on the money we borrowed to make them; the telegraph yields much more than the interest; and as for immigration, since every immigrant immediately begins to pay each year a contribution to the revenue equal to a third of his passage money, he pays greatly more than the interest on all that is borrowed to bring him. Then if you take off these 70 millions for only three income-earning items, there are not much more than 26 millions left as the debt on which the interest is not actually earned even now.

In the second place, let me refer to revenue. It has grown in the last 20 years twice as fast as our commerce

or population; it has more than doubled itself since 1870, and it has trebled itself since 1860:—

If you could raise the same sum per head in England as easily as we raise it in Australia, Mr. Gladstone would be dealing to-day with a revenue of 245 millions.

And you must not suppose that this revenue means taxation to the same amount. We divide our revenue into three parts: one we derive from Crown lands, which of course is not taxation; another from railways, telegraphs, &c., which we call payment for services rendered; and it is only the residue which can be called 'taxation' at all. In a paper read last month by Mr. Brett before the Institute of Bankers, he put the proportion of Australasian revenue for 1880 which was raised by taxation, at a little over 6 millions; it would be an outside estimate to put it now at 7 millions, or a third of our total revenue.

We derive four times as much revenue from Customs per head as in England, six times as much as in France, ten times as much as in Germany, and nearly three times as much as in the United States. Our Customs duties are 5 per cent on our commerce, compared with 3½ per cent in Great Britain, and 4 per cent, in France; but they press much less heavily on us than they do in the United States, where they are equal to 13 per cent.

In the following table the progress in the revenue of each colony is shown separately:—

Out of this total of more than 21 millions, about 5 millions are land revenue.

I have said that in the last 20 years our revenue increased twice as fast as the population. Now if we may suppose that in the next 10 years the revenue will not do more than keep pace with the population, instead of growing twice as fast, it will amount in 1890 to nearly 30 millions, and at the end of the century to not far from 50 millions. Even now our revenue is equal to that of many nations of Europe, and not much less than the revenue of Austria, or even of Russia, was at the accession of Queen Victoria.

It is a common mistake to suppose that the annual charge of our debt, in proportion to the revenue, is heavier than in other countries. On the contrary, it is lighter than in most of the great countries of Europe. The charge of our debt absorbs 25 per cent, of our revenue, against 33 per cent, in England, 41 in France, 30 in Russia, 12 in Germany, 32 in Austria, 47 in Italy, 37 in Spain, and 31 in Belgium. It is only in the United States that the charge of the public debt absorbs so small a part as 16 per cent, of the revenue.

But although the annual charge of our debt absorbs 25 per cent, of our revenue, it is worth while considering its relation to the other income we possess. Now the gross annual product of the Australian industry is very large for our numbers. We derive from

From these 133 millions our Governments take 21 millions for revenue, and we have 112 millions to do what we like with. We save 27 millions, and the rest we spend upon ourselves. You will say this is a very extravagant rate of national expenditure. But we take care of our money all the same, for while the deposits in our banks were only 48 millions five years ago, they now exceed 60 millions, and the annual increase is going on at the rate of 3 millions a year. And our savings are, in proportion to gross income, much higher than in England or France.

There is also another thing to be considered in relation to the charge of our debt. Our land revenue, speaking broadly, is about the same as the interest of the debt. It would be a good way of putting it if I said that we apply our land revenue to paying interest on the money we have borrowed for railways, immigration, and public works. It is often made a reproach to us that we have discarded the famous Wakefield theory, and are using our land fund for ordinary affairs of government instead of applying it to the purposes of colonisation. But do we not, in reality, apply it to those purposes, when we use it for paying interest on the money by which alone those purposes could have been secured?

I was saying just now that our public debt had increased 86 millions since 1860. Well, let us compare for a moment this increase in the debt with the increase in revenue and trade.

The increase of exports in the last 10 years has been more than 20 millions, while the revenue has increased more than 10 millions. It is clear, therefore, that the colonists have been doing a very fine business in borrowing English capital at 4 or 5 per cent., and obtaining an increase of production yearly equal to 33 per cent, of the total amount they have borrowed, at the same time as the increase in revenue was equal to 16 per cent, on the loan capital. And it follows that although our debt has so largely increased, the security for it has improved, since our profits have risen at least three times more than the additional interest we have to pay.

It is true that the ratio of debt to total assets is now much higher than it was in 1860 and 1870, because at that time the colonies had hardly begun their borrowings. Comparing our assets with our debt, these are the results in millions sterling, exclusive of the public lands:—

If the value of the Crown lands were included, the assets of the colonies would have to be stated at much more than 1,000 millions; but I especially exclude these now. Leaving the Crown lands out altogether, the value of our assets has risen 400 millions in the last 20 years, and 275 millions since 1870; and the rise in the last 12 years has been at an average rate of 23 millions per annum: this is more than double the rate of accumulation in the United Kingdom, for our ratio is equal to £9 per head as compared with £4 here. Our assets, in fact, have increased nearly five times as much as our debt since 1870, and this without taking in the Crown lands at all;

while it is certain that the Crown lands are now much more valuable than they were then. For instance; the rental of Crown lands occupied by squatters has risen in the last ten years from £500,000 to £800,000; and on the west coast of New Zealand, Crown land, which only three years ago was worthless on account of the Maori troubles, sold the other day first-hand at a Government sale as high as £16 per acre, and the average of the sale exceeded £7.

The following table shows how the public debts and assets are distributed between the Colonies:—

And the following table shows the way in which these assets are made up, in millions sterling:—

I will now take the rise in value of these assets in the last 20 years, not by comparing the assets of each colony, but by grouping the assets together under a few chief heads. The capital value of these in millions was as follows in 1860, 1870, and now:—

In this table I am only taking the value of sheep at ten shillings a head, but I need not say to any squatter who is listening to me, that I do not suppose he would sell his runs at a price which only reckoned his sheep at ten shillings.

So far with respect to the question of assets. But it is not only to the capital value of a country's assets that the financier looks for the safety of the money he lends to it. He looks more closely at the power of the community to bear whatever burthen of taxation is necessary to ensure the punctual payment of his interest, Now it is perhaps the safest, and at any rate it is an easy, way of measuring the burthen of a public debt in any nation, to compare the amount of the interest it has to pay on its debt with the earnings of its people, and their annual accumulations. This is shown, for a few cases, in the following table:—

The annual savings here given are after the payment of interest on the public debt; and thus the burthen of our debt as against savings, is fully one-third more in Australasia than it is in England, and rather more than it is in France, but less than one-third of what it is in Italy. Here I may refer, in passing, to the marvellous condition of the United States, where the annual earnings already exceed those of England by nearly 200 millions a year, while the annual savings are more than double those of England, making the burthen of the debt almost in-appreciable: Yet if we examine the annual earnings of England, France, Italy, and even the States with those of Australasia, it will be seen that the average per head shows very favourably for us:—

Thus the income of the Australasian is so much better than that of the Englishman or the American, that although the apparent burthen of the debt per head of the population is greater, its real weight is much less. He can accumulate 24 per cent, of his income, while the average accumulation in the United Kingdom is only 13 per cent., in France 19 per cent., and in the United States 22 per cent. The taxation, accordingly, which he has to bear in order to pay his share of the interest on the debt, is much less oppressive upon him than it is on the inhabitants of other countries.

The incidence of taxation upon a people is always a subject of engrossing interest; and it is now demanding incessant attention from every public man who has to do with the finances of the country in which he lives. Everywhere the demands of each community are pressing more and more on the resources of their Governments, and everywhere it is becoming more and more difficult to meet the increasing volume of national expenditure. In no country is the struggle between the Treasury and the Parliament more constant as to expenditure than it is with us on the other side of the world; and we cannot complain, when the English capitalist hears so often of the "great burthen of taxation" which so much debt imposes upon us, if he gets alarmed at the apparent recklessness with which we seem to be increasing it. You all know that in New Zealand the burthen of the debt in proportion to the population far exceeds that of any other colony, and that our taxation is very severe compared with that of our neighbours. Yet when we recently had to examine closely what the incidence of taxation in New Zealand really was, some very curious results came out. We had suddenly to impose new taxation, three years ago, to an extent which in England would give a new revenue of 15 millions. The question before us was whether the existing taxation pressed unfairly on any particular class, and especially upon the class which was least able to bear it. We divided, for the purpose of the enquiry, the population into three classes: the wage-earning class, the intermediate class between wage-earners and owners of property, and the propertied class. The most careful calculations were made into the earnings and expenditure of the wage-earning class, following the best authorities on the subject; the results were carefully checked by comparison with calculations relating to the same class in England; and we found that while the taxation paid by the "intermediate class" was £2. 13s. 3d. per head, and by the "propertied class" £6. 18s. 6d. per head, the taxation paid by the "wage-earning class" did not exceed 17s. 3d. per head, against 27s. 3d. per head by the same class in England. Now if you compare the taxation per head with the earnings of the working classes, you will have some idea of the great difference between their condition in New Zealand and their condition in England, where the cost of some necessaries of life is much higher and the rate of wages much lower. This is the secret of our attaining the high rate of savings to which I have just referred.

But while this accumulation of wealth in Australasia is sure to go on side by side with the growth of our population and industries, it is equally sure that our public debt will not increase in the same ratio. Increase it

certainly will, and I should be wasting your time if I did not say so plainly. But we have not to build again the railways we have made, nor the public buildings we have put up. It is quite beyond doubt that the increase of our wealth will be far greater in the next 10 years than the increase in our debt, and if we are "good security" now for the amount of debt we have already incurred, no statistician would for a moment doubt that we shall be far better security for whatever we shall owe then. I have already shown that in the past 12 years our assets have increased nearly five times as much as our debt, and if the same ratio is maintained in the next ten years the amount of our debt will then seem really insignificant. According to the growth of our population since 1870, we ought to number more than four millions of people in 1890, and nearly seven millions at the end of the century. It would require our debt to be then 230 millions to maintain the same proportion to population as it bears now; and it is of course quite needless for me to say that there is not the remotest chance of our adding 135 millions to our debt in the next 18 years, or anything approaching to it. I believe I am well within the mark in saying that 150 millions will be the outside we shall then owe; while even if our progress in that time should be no faster than during the last ten years, our revenue will be not far from 50 millions, our commerce nearly 270 millions, and our assets, without counting the Crown lands, at least 1,300 millions.

But although I am chiefly concerned with the relation between our resources and our public debt, no statement which is confined to the debt would give a true idea of the extent to which English capital is embarked with us. Besides the money which has been lent to our Governments, more than 110 millions of English capital are even now embarked with us in private loans: counting the commerce, there are more than 260 millions of your money altogether placed with us: and we return you altogether 18 millions a year in the shape of interest. One-fifth of the total amount of English capital invested throughout the world outside of England, is already embarked with us, and this proportion is growing every day. The amount of our public debt is after all much the smaller part of what we owe you. Yet when the financier is tempted to doubt our power to pay him his interest on the one, he may be reassured by the confidence which the merchant has in the commerce which ensures so much of the interest on the other. Let us look a little into this.

Already the commercial growth of Australasia surpasses that of most countries, and since 1870 only the United States have shown a higher increase. Taking, for the purpose of comparison, the year 1880 as par, the commerce of the following countries has grown in this way:—

And if you compare the volume of trade with population in these countries, you will see how greatly Australasia distances the rest:—

Thus while the total volume of our trade is but a sixth of that of England, the amount of business per head is twice as great. It would be a good way of illustrating our trading activity, if I said that one Australasian does as much trade as 2 Englishmen, 4 Frenchmen, 5 Germans, 6 Americans, or 8 Italians.

Moreover the increase in the value of our exports, notwithstanding a great falling off in the production of gold, shows the rate at which the progress of the 20 years from 1860 to 1880 was going on:—

The commerce of Australasia is now greater than that of the United Kingdom at the accession of Queen Victoria. It was 94 millions only two years ago, and is now about 100. The Queen ascended the throne in 1837, and the Board of Trade Returns for that year showed that after deducting 'goods in transit,' the volume of the commerce of the United Kingdom for 1836 was only 98 millions. If our trade goes on increasing only as it has done in the last ten years, it will amount in 1890 to 163 millions, and at the end of the century to 267 millions. I was showing you just now that the ratio of our trade per inhabitant was £34; this is over all Australasia; but already it is £40 per inhabitant in New South Wales, which is much higher than the rest of the group, and is nearly three times as great as in England, four times as great as in France, and seven times as great as in the United States.

Australasia now takes from you British goods at the rate of £8 per inhabitant, while the United States only take twelve shillings, France nine shillings, and Germany eight. In other words, one of us Australasians is worth more to the English manufacturer than a dozen Americans, 18 Frenchmen, or 20 Germans. Is this trade worth keeping by you? Then it is worth extending. Instead of letting us stay where we are, help us with your capital to accelerate the speed which has already marked our advance. Only when you have any reason to be afraid that this trade is unprofitable either to us or to yourselves, will it be time for you to doubt whether it is worth your while to lend us the money we must have if our population and our trade are to be developed as we wish and mean them to be. I am not saying that you have begun to be afraid. On the contrary: to-day the price of all our 4 per cent, stocks is either at or above par:—

And it is not so long ago that the *Economist*, a journal as much relied upon for its caution as its ability, was saying that the time had come when New South Wales—admittedly, I allow, the richest of us all, with her surplus of 2 millions for 1882 and probable revenue of 8 millions in 1883—could safely expect to place a loan at 3½ per cent.

I have told you that I excluded the Crown lands altogether in valuing our assets. The area of the United Kingdom is 80 million acres, while there are 2,000 millions of acres within our vast boundaries. These are no

mere "assets" of ours. They are the splendid patrimony of England, which she confides to us to deal with as trustees for the benefit of the empire. Let me for a moment ask your attention to the strides which have taken place in the occupation of this great estate, and give you an idea of the wealth it is producing.

I will first take the land occupied in pastoral pursuits, because the use of it in that way precedes the wave of agricultural settlement. The country occupied by the squatters is as follows:—

That is to say, our squatters occupy a territory four times as large as France; and yet it is not even a third of the vast area of 2,000 million acres which is our portion of the surface of the earth.

But we have nine times as many freeholders as squatters. Six per cent, of our people are owners of land, and the number of their holdings is very great:—

If you add the 64 millions of acres occupied by farmers to the 540 millions occupied by squatters, you have a total of more than 600 millions of acres in actual occupation: an amount which, though not a third of our territory, is larger than England, France, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Italy, Belgium, Holland, and Switzerland, all put together.

And what is it we do with this territory? In the first place we have flocks and herds which have multiplied nearly three-fold in value during the last twenty years:—

The care of these flocks and herds occupies 168, persons, and they yielded in 1880 a total gross product of 39 millions:—

Let me ask you for a moment to think what this trade in wool alone means. We owe England 9G millions; well, in the last five years we have sent you more than 100 millions worth of wool; and if we do not send you an ounce more than we are doing, that is to say if our flocks only remain where they are to-day, you will before the end of the century have given us 400 million sovereigns for this article of commerce alone. Nor shall I be satisfied with only asking you to look at this wool production of Australasia as the chief source of our wealth. Rather I would invite you to think how it has not only grown to be one of your great necessities of life, but is also something which you can get nowhere else. For large as are the supplies of wool of various sorts which are drawn from other countries, the world has not yet succeeded in producing wool of a higher class than the Australian merino; and you may well ask yourselves how you could now get on without it.

Then if we turn to agriculture, what do our freeholds raise? Agriculture employs with us 392,000 persons, the gross product of whose labour is 36 millions, divided in this way:—

The capital value of these farms is 182 millions sterling. If, then, you add the 68 millions which I have given as the value of our cattle and sheep, you will see that our agricultural and pastoral capital is already 250 millions. Now I have just said that the gross product of the two pastoral and agricultural industries together, is little less than 76 millions sterling per annum: and even if you take off three-fourths of this as working expenses—an estimate which would not give as much as 8 per cent. on the capital employed—there would still be left a net return of 20 millions, which is four times the sum we have to pay as interest on the public debt.

The acreage of grain and other crops has multiplied six times since 1860. In that year we had less than 1½ million acres under tillage; we have now more than 10 million acres, of which not far from half is in New Zealand. I do not like to break the general line of what I am saying by alluding to any colony in particular, but I cannot forbear asking your attention to the noticeable extent of cultivated land in New Zealand; and especially to the fact that in 1881 New Zealand had 3½ million acres laid down to English grasses out of 4¾ million acres cultivated, which is a much larger proportion than in England and Scotland, where (according to the Agricultural Returns for 1882 just issued by the Board of Trade) the permanent pasture is 46 per cent, of the cultivated land. The same Returns give the area under wheat in the Australasian colonies last harvest at 3,361,000 acres, or 200,000 acres more than the area under wheat in the United Kingdom this year: and they show, that while the average yield for all Australasia was 9 bushels, against 10 bushels for all the United States, the yield in New Zealand was 22½ bushels to the acre.

The details of cultivation for the respective colonies are these:—

I would like to call your attention to the fact that the number of holdings compared to population is larger than anywhere in the world. This fact alone is really one of the best securities to which the English capitalist can look for the stability of our public finance.

In what I have already said, I have called your attention to the great development of material wealth which has been taking place. But the financier looks more closely, as I was saying a little while ago, to the number of population than to anything else, when he is examining the potentialities of a new country which is incurring a heavy public debt. In England and France, for instance, he knows there is a vast reserve of accumulated wealth to form a perfect security; as when, in 1817 after the great war, the debt of England was 841 millions while there were less than 20 millions of people to bear it; or again, when in 1870 France suddenly asked for 200 millions to liberate her territory and the world offered her 1,500 millions, and when her nearly stationary population, which had in a single year of war suffered a loss of many hundreds of millions of capital, not only freely gave a revenue of 110 millions, but increased her own wealth every day. In the United States the

financier sees a people advancing in numbers by leaps and bounds, and passing even England and France in its yearly accumulations. We in Australasia cannot present such vast numbers to his gaze: yet we may ask him to reflect a little on the increase in our population, when we tell him that it is proportionately going on much faster than even in the great Republic.

The Australasian census for 1861 showed that we had 1,315,000 people. In the succeeding 10 years we had 280,000 immigrants, and the total increase of that decade was 660,000: so that we had 380,000 excess of births over deaths in that time; that is to say, there was a natural increase of 29 per cent, in the decade. In Europe the increase of population did not exceed 10 per cent. Between 1860 and 1870, Australasia had a natural increase of twice the rate of the United States, and three times that of Europe. Our present population, allowing for increase since 1880, is 2,844,000; in round numbers we may call it 3 millions, including the Maoris in New Zealand. In the 10 years between 1870 and 1880 we had 307,000 immigrants, and the excess of births over deaths was 701,000; that is to say, there was a natural increase of 32 per cent, in the decade. Now during the same 10 years the natural increase in the United States was 24 per cent., and in Europe under 9 per cent.

If during the next 18 years the same rate of increase in Australasia is maintained as has taken place in the last 10, we shall be nearly seven millions at the end of the century, and the probable distribution of our numbers will be this;—

I may perhaps be forgiven, as one of the Founders of New Zealand, to point with pride to the probability of her possessing, as I have just shown, the greatest numbers at the end of the century. This will arise from her having the highest rate of natural increase in the world:—

Thus the velocity in the natural augmentation of our people has been much greater than that of the United States, more than twice that of England or Germany, and 15 times that of France. Including immigrants, the population in Australasia grows 50 per cent, faster than in the United States, and three times as fast as in England. In a new country population is the chief element of national wealth and progress. How narrow, then, is the class prejudice which in some of our colonies would check the tide of immigration, and arrest the onward numbering of our people! Nor, happily for us, have we to dread the evils which in Europe retard the growth of every nation. Not only are we free from the load of pauperism by which they are oppressed; the ratio of sickness is so low, that the vitality of the people is at a very high point. In England, the adults between the ages of 20 and 60 undergo, in that period of 40 years, an average of 11 days of sickness in each year; in Australia they have only to undergo seven days, and in New Zealand hardly more than five. England loses 3 per cent, of the productive power of her people by pauperism, and 4 per cent. by sickness, or in all 7 per cent.; the total loss in Australasia is only 2½ per cent., which is the lowest of any country in the world. The vital statistics of Australasia, in fact, are far better than in any other country whatever, and the highest natural increase is that of New Zealand, namely 30 per 1,000, or 3 per cent, on the population, which is the highest ratio in the world. Thus in what creates and preserves the strength of a people, we stand pre-eminent. Does it need that I should ask you whether so great a vitality does not offer the most solid guarantee for the safety of our public finance?

I should not omit to invite your attention to the very material question whether our railways are a paying investment for the money we have borrowed to build them. I must in the first place repeat, that as we have spent more than 56 millions upon them, they have absorbed much more than half our debt. But for this expenditure on railways, we should hardly owe more than 40 millions: and it has been greater, compared to population, than in any other country of the world except England.

The following table gives the distribution of the railways in the several colonies:—

Let us now look for a moment into the question of nett earnings on these lines. In 1880, the average nett earning of all the railways in the world was 41/8 per cent, on the capital; in the United States it was 5 ½; in Germany 41/8; in France nearly 5; and in England rather less than 4¼ per cent. In Australasia, taking all the colonies and all the lines together, it is not quite 4 per cent.; but this is steadily increasing. It must be remembered that our railways are not like those made in countries where the growth of the population is slow, or where, as in France, the population is nearly stationary and the room for increase of traffic small. Our population is sparse, and our lines are made more with the purpose of opening country to new settlement and occupation, than for the purpose of serving people already settled. The rate of interest yielded by our lines, after paying working expenses, is not only increasing, but in some places is showing rather surprising results, of which I will give you a few instances.

The nett yield of the New South Wales lines is now close on 4½ per cent.; in Victoria rather more than 4; in South Australia 3½; in Queensland nearly 2¾ and in New Zealand close on 4. But the nett earnings of the north-eastern system in Victoria (284 miles) now exceed 8½ per cent.; one short line in South Australia is earning 71/8; and in New Zealand the main trunk line of the Middle Island (260 miles) has just earned nett 51/8 over all, while the Dunedin section of it (115 miles) has earned more than 6½, and the Christchurch section (145 miles) within a fraction of 8 per cent. nett.

Nor must it be forgotten that this revenue is very much less than would be received if the lines belonged to

private companies. Not only is it never an object with our Governments, as would be the case with companies, to show 'big dividends'; on the contrary, the people insist on rates being kept down to the very lowest point, and there is an incessant warfare going on between the public and the railway departments as to the reductions demanded in the working tariff. If it were not for this, I believe I should be safe in saying that the north-eastern system in Victoria and the Christchurch section in New Zealand, would even now be earning a nett 10 per cent. And so, in the nature of things, it must continue to be. The lines are there, but the people are not. They will be there presently; and it will certainly not be long before the nett yield of the Australasian lines surpasses that of any European country.

I have detained you so long, that I must leave unnoticed many other evidences of progress and stability such as may be seen in the statistics of our banking, and of our mining enterprise. It has been said that we are on the threshold of a gold-famine; but Australasia, which has already sent you more than 260 millions sterling of gold, equal to nearly half all the coinage in the world and 21 per cent, of all the gold known to be extant, will yet send you plenty more. The diamond drill is making a revolution in gold mining. In former days the only means of exploring at great depths was by sinking shafts, which often ended in money, time, and labour being all thrown away; to-day, the diamond drill pierces the hard rock fast enough to let the miner do in hours what once cost him days, and deep ground is now being tested with high results, which must otherwise have been left untouched.

Nor have I space to speak of the wheat we send you, nor of the wine we shall soon send too. The Board of Trade Returns give our area in vineyard now at 15,000 acres; but what may be looked for hereafter is evidenced by California, where the area in vineyard is already 100,000 acres, with a probable production in three or four years of 40 million gallons. What is of greater consequence from a national point of view, we have great fields of coal: nor is it necessary to point out what it means to the naval power of England, to hold the command of a vast coal supply in the southern seas.

I hardly like to single out any industry for notice, yet there is an entirely new one which not only must be counted among the greatest of the resources of Australasia, but is probably destined to produce a far-reaching change even in England.

It would be a platitude to say that the food supply of a people is a matter of national importance. Mr. Mulhall lately pointed out in his 'Balance Sheet of the World,' that you are becoming more and more dependent upon foreign nations not only for your grain but for your meat. We know there is no fear of corn being ever dear again here, for although England requires to import nearly 300 million bushels, or 40 per cent, of her consumption, she has the choice of so many countries to get it from, that cheap bread for her people is practically assured. But it is not so with meat. You consume 120 lbs. of meat and only produce 80, so that you have to get 40 somewhere. In fact you consume more than double the average of Europe. If you were content, for instance, to eat no more meat than is eaten in France, your own production would be nearly sufficient. Instead of that, you have to import more than 600,000 tons of meat every year; and if population goes on increasing as it has been doing, it will not be long before you find that you are only producing as much meat as will feed your people for 5 months in the year, and you will have to import a million tons. But all this time your power of supplying the deficiency is steadily decreasing. The Board of Trade Returns just issued show that you have 100,000 less cattle and half a million less sheep than last year; that last year you had 2 million less sheep than the year before; and that in Ireland there are only about two-thirds of the sheep there were 10 years ago. It is not so long since you had 40 million sheep, and now you have only 28 million all told. Meat is in consequence fast rising in price, and this rise is becoming, for the people of this country, a matter for serious alarm. Ten years ago the wholesale price at Smithfield was *Sd.* a pound, it is now *10d.*; and those best qualified to judge predict as certain a still further advance. Only the other day the wholesale salesmen in the metropolitan meat market were getting *10½d.* and *11d.* for American fresh meat, and, but for that supply, it was openly asserted that beef would have been selling in the London shops at half-a-crown a pound. But you can no longer make sure of American supply even at *11d.* Notwithstanding the fact that (according to the Board of Trade Returns) there were last year 33 million cattle and 43 million sheep in the States, it is quite certain that the prodigious increase in the population of the States and Canada is fast overtaking their own available stock of meat: and speaking as one who has himself been a "squatter" all his life, I do not hesitate to say that it will not be long before it becomes impossible for either the States or the Dominion to keep up the supplies of meat they have been sending you. I am fortified in this opinion by a much higher authority than mine. The *Quarterly Review* has just told us that "beef is at this moment as dear in New York as in London, and the power of the States to supply England with meat is obviously declining. The greatest perplexity with which statesmen can be threatened, a deficiency in one of the most essential staples of the nation's food, seems to be impending over Great Britain and Ireland." The Agricultural Returns for 1882 which I have just quoted, show how enormously the imports of meat into England have increased in the last 10 years. Including fresh and salt meats, hams and bacon, and live cattle, these imports, which in 1871 were under 11 millions, had risen in 1881 to £24,754,000.

Moreover, in the last 20 years both the rate and cost of consumption have so much more than doubled, that the value consumed per head, which in 1863 was only £l. (6s. 10d., is now £3. 0s. 2d. It is not three years ago since Mr. Head and Mr. Pell computed that American meat could be sold in Liverpool to a profit at 6½d. per pound; but the cost of rearing has since so much increased that it cannot now be placed in England under 7½d. The average price of imported oxen, which in 1870 was £18, is now nearly £22; and the average price of sheep, which was under 35s then, is now 47s. It has become imperatively necessary for you to look betimes to other sources: and it is the insight into this necessity, now fast changing into a formidable danger, that has now led to the creation of an entirely new trade, in meat which has been frozen on the other side of the earth.

The question was whether the thing could be done at all. There were two problems to be solved; one whether meat in a frozen state could pass through the great heat of the tropics and get here fit for human food; the other, whether it could be sent here at a profit. Both these questions have been answered in the affirmative. Some months ago, 5,000 frozen sheep came here in one lot from New Zealand. The conditions were rather adverse to success: the voyage had been prolonged to over 90 days, the heat experienced in the tropics had been exceptionally great, and the ship had been becalmed upon the Line; but the very fact of these conditions being so adverse, enabled the freezing process to be thoroughly tested. It had been feared that the sheep packed in the lower tiers would be crushed and bruised by the weight of those above, but nothing of the kind occurred. The meat arrived here in such excellent condition that the whole of it was sold within a fortnight. It was taken out of the freezing chamber at night and sent to Smithfield market, where it was still hard frozen when the butchers came to buy it in the morning. Such a thing as a cargo of 5,000 frozen sheep never having been seen before, it attracted much attention, even the *Times* speaking of it as a "prodigious fact." The meat was readily taken into consumption, and I can speak from my own experience of how sweet and good in quality it was. It was proved that it is not of the least consequence how long the meat remains frozen, or what is the outside temperature: you put it into one freezing chamber 12,000 miles off, and you take it out of another here three months after-wards, as sweet and fresh as it was the first day.

The first part of the problem had therefore been solved: it remained to be seen how the money part of it would come out. The gross proceeds for the 5,000 sheep came to £7,978: the charges, including freight and insurance, coal, expenses of sending to the markets in London and Glasgow, and sale commissions, to £3,793, or a little under 3½d. a lb. The sheep netted 21s. 9d. a-piece, a return eminently satisfactory to their owners, because they would not have sold for more than 12s. in New Zealand. It happened that the meat arrived here at a good time for the shippers, and rather better prices were then obtained than could be expected as a rule; but, on the other hand, there was strong prejudice to overcome, there were no regular channels for the sale, no properly constructed cool chambers in which to store the meat and thaw it by degrees, so as to turn it out at its best in quantities suited to the day's demand; above all, there was undisguised hostility from many of the retail butchers. Nevertheless, it was soon quite clear that as the wholesale price to the salesman had only been a fraction over 6½d. a lb., a very good profit was left to the retailer. It may now, I think, be safely said that frozen meat in any quantity can be placed upon this market from the other side of the world at 6d. to 6½d. a lb., leaving a good profit to the grower. This ought ultimately to make meat cheaper here, or at least prevent the further rise now threatened. Australia and New Zealand can, in fact, export 700,000 tons of meat a year, or 2,000 tons a day, which is not much more than you want in England even now, without reducing even the present capital number of their sheep and cattle; and we are able to send our sheep to Smithfield with greater ease to-day than the Tweed farmers could theirs 100 years ago, when meat was selling at a penny a pound in Scotland against tenpence in London. The existence of this immense reserve of food supply at the command of England, is already being welcomed, not only by householders but by statesmen, as it deserves.

When the first shipment of 5,000 sheep arrived, fears were entertained that the inroad of such numbers must have a very evil effect on the value of land in England; and even the Duke of St. Albans said so in a letter to the *Times*. I believe any alarm of the kind to be a complete delusion. But if it were otherwise, surely it cannot be denied that if we in Australasia can afford to supply you with sweet and wholesome meat at 6d. to 6½d. a pound, there is in it the promise of a great boon to the poorer classes, and one that will be welcomed in every household. I was saying just now that there was strong prejudice to overcome; and really, if you had to believe the butchers, you would imagine there was something dreadful and disgusting in the idea of eating frozen meat, forgetting how many millions of the human race even now subsist on frozen food for a large part of every year. I daresay some of you have read a lively and entertaining account which appeared last August in the *Daily News*, in which we were told of milk sold by the cubic foot, and wine sold in lumps like coal; of the Gostinnöi market-place with its countless rows of oxen, pyramids of pigs, mountains of sheep and goats, sacks of little fish that rattled like walnuts, blocks of salmon and sturgeon cut out of the snow with axes, and sledge-loads of snow-white hares and reindeer lying as if asleep; where the butcher made no distinctions about his joints, but sold them in square blocks, and where the children gathered up the dust that fell upon the snow, for it was powdered meat: or of another market-place in Canada, where there were singed pigs standing upright, deer

from the backwoods, obelisks of cod and haddock, and solid milk in columns. Even now nearly 12 millions of the human race are consuming a million tons of frozen food each year; and the wonder will soon be that there should be any prejudice about it in England. I ask you whether this new industry of ours is not a matter of national importance? And I say again to-night, as I said in answer to the Duke of St. Albans' letter, that if the landowners and farmers of England are tempted for a moment to look askance at so novel a competition from us, they ought to think how vast is the supply that must be had somewhere every year, and how much better it is for England that she should come to us for part, rather than continue to be dependent on foreign countries for the whole.

Before closing this paper, I ought not to omit one subject to which we in Australia and New Zealand may point with legitimate pride. Amidst the bustle of a great material prosperity we have not forgotten the duty which every country owes to the education of its children. We have so munificent a provision for education, that if your expenditure in England were on the same level you would have to devote 25 millions a year to it; and we have founded Universities of which so young a people may well be proud. We recognise the truth of what the *Times* was saying only yesterday, that 'at this moment education is the greatest question of the day; that there is no hold upon the millions except the appeal to their right reason, their healthy sentiment, and their sound information; and that if all classes are not well instructed and well trained by the end of this century, then woe to the British Constitution of our fond idolatry.' We know that this truth is not more essential in politics than in finance. And if you have trusted us with great sums, you will see, in what I am saying at this moment about the education of Australasia, the surest element of our future power, and a material guarantee for the honest payment of the money you have lent us.

Well, I am very sure that by this time I have exhausted all your patience; and indeed I have only a few more words to say. If you have gone with me into all these details without distaste, you will be glad to know that I am not asking you to take them on my authority alone. For some time past I have been engaged in the investigation of financial questions with Mr. Mulhall, the well-known statistician, and it is to his friendship that I owe the figures on which this paper rests. I really was afraid that if I presented them to you as my own, you would think I was 'romancing'; and I knew you would be more satisfied if you could rely for them on the guarantee of his name, where they have not been taken by myself from official records. The statist is often voted a bore, even by politicians who forget how much they are indebted, for an insight into affairs, to his patient industry and research: but the bright way in which Mr. Mulhall presents his figures always makes them interesting. The statist records either the rise or the decay of nations: and it is because the Royal Colonial Institute best fulfils its mission when it looks at questions from a national standpoint, that I have thought it would be pleasing to you to have such a poor picture as I could give, not of a single country, but of a group of colonies some of which were founded by men now in this room. My immediate purpose, I do not deny it, was to inspire a firmer confidence in our financial strength, and remove the fear that our public debt was getting too much for us. But I also had another aim. To Englishmen who think much upon affairs, there can hardly be a more curious speculation than the one of what ultimate shape the connection between England and her colonies will take, and whether these will bear themselves worthy of a high destiny. It is well, then, to mark from time to time what stages her great dependencies have reached, and what lessons there may be in the story for us all. But how wide must be our survey! In one continent, India must ever remain the most wondrous and fascinating monument to the genius of the men whom England sends forth to conquer the world: in another, the great Dominion beyond the Atlantic sweeps on to a dazzling future: in a third, the disaster of a day is avenged by victories which place in England's hands the destinies of Africa. And we too come from the other side of the earth, to take our place in this marvellous company of nations. I often hear the reproach that we are not more separated from you by our vanity and arrogance, than we are divided among ourselves by narrow provincial jealousies, by conflicts of fiscal policy, by the very rivalries that have made us what we are. But all this will one day vanish in the 'infinite azure of the past/ If it is true that we are divided among ourselves, it is not less true that we are united to England by her glorious traditions, by her immortal literature, by the example of her private life, by the political liberties which have been her precious gift to us; above all, by loyalty to our Queen, and by love of country, that well-spring of all national virtue. So splendid an inheritance cannot but *one* day stifle petty and ignoble dissensions in our midst, as it will assuredly make us only more and more tenacious of our union with the fatherland. That union is our hearts' desire. It is maintained by the cordial relations which the Colonial Office preserves with us, by the true goodwill of so many English statesmen, by the rule of Governors like Lord Normanby and Sir Hercules Robinson, and (with only a few exceptions) by a generous public opinion: nor is it here, and in the presence of the Royal Colonial Institute, that I could forget how it is strengthened by the gracious interest of your illustrious President, and by the personal and practical co-operation of men like our noble Chairman to-night. May these genial kindly sympathies ever flourish! So shall you join hands with us across the sea, and cherish the remembrance that we too, with yourselves, belong to England, and are citizens of the greatest Empire the world has ever seen.

Spottiswoode & Co., Printers, New-Street Square London.

A Speech on the Possible Future Developments of Governments in free States. Delivered before the "Union Debating Society," At Wellington, N.Z., BY JAMES EDWARD FITZGERALD, C.M.G., *Controller and Auditor General*, November 15, 1882. Wellington: Edwards & Green, Printers, Brandon Street. MDCCCLXXXII.

The Possible Future Developments of Governments in free states.

I PROPOSE to speak to-night of certain possible future developments in the Governments of free States. Perhaps it may form the best introduction to such a subject if I glance very briefly at the growth of Governments in civilized countries up to the present time. In doing so I will occupy but a few minutes whilst I sketch in the rudest outline the main features of that history with which, no doubt, you are all well acquainted;—and that only for the purpose of contrasting the condition under which Governments of the present day exist, with those of earlier periods.

It may be assumed that all government had its origin in the physical conditions of our nature—in the government of the father over his children; that it expanded into the patriarchal—the government by the head of a cluster of related households; that it further developed into the tribal, under the headship of the chief; and lastly consolidated into the national—the community of race, under the authority of the king. Under the chief or king in early times, the decisions of the ruling power, so far as they affected the action of the community, were often submitted to the assembled people, and were assented to or rejected by acclamation: and thus a rude democracy restrained in some fashion the will of the monarch. Personal equality of right was the rule where all were equally warriors. In this, however, there was one wide exception: for slavery appears amongst the earliest communities of which we have cognizance; and slavery arose from the conquest of feebler by stronger races. Slaves were chattels, not citizens; they had no existence in the polity of the State. Thus, even when Athens was at its greatest, and possessed a definite political constitution, and was perhaps the most perfect specimen of a democracy in ancient history, the slaves constituted a body which is said by some to have included nearly two-thirds of the whole population. It was a democracy in which two-thirds of the people were no part of the *Demos*. The kingly power was sometimes hereditary, sometimes elective, as custom had grown up in different communities: and sometimes it partook of both characters, being elective within the limits of the ruling family; often subject to disruption by the appearance of some man towering above his fellows in wisdom, courage and physical strength,—in all those attributes by which men acquire, by their own inherent character, the power to dominate over wills inferior to their own. Dynasties were changed by the Napoleons amongst mankind. Side by side with the kingly office grew up that of subordinate princes, who ruled each in his own territory, with power similar to that of the monarch; not unfrequently disputing and restraining his authority, and sometimes overshadowing the throne itself. A later period saw the growth of the political influence of the middle classes through the growing wealth and power of the towns; and a still later, the fall of the great feudatories, and the absorption of their power into that of the king; and from that epoch we trace the long struggle between the middle classes and the throne, to restrain the despotic power of the king within the limits of settled constitutional law. I say between the middle classes, because at the commencement of this struggle, the great mass of the people were little considered. There had been from time to time great popular outbursts of the lowest stratum of society, such as that of the *Jacquerie* in France, and the rising headed by *Jack Cade* in England; but as a rule it may be said the mass of the people had as little influence on the Government as the slaves had in Athens. But the last chapter in the history of government—a chapter not yet closed in many civilized countries—records the gradual extension to all classes of the community of a share in the councils of the State, and of the right of all to be bound by no laws except those to which they had signified their assent by the voice of their representatives in the popular assemblies.

The machinery of representation is of modern growth. It has been remarked by writers that there is little or no trace of such a contrivance in classical history; as little is there amongst oriental nations, or amongst those northern races from whom the civilized world has mainly sprung. The personal appeal to an assembled people could have been possible only in comparatively small communities. The delegation of political power to representatives was therefore the natural result of the enlargement of nationalities, combined with the sentiment of personal freedom handed down from the earliest traditions of a race. There have, however, been occasions when the contrivances of modern civilization have been utilized to enable a direct appeal to the masses of the people, without the intervention of representatives. Such we saw upon two occasions, when the late emperor of the French appealed to the people by means of a plebiscite, to confirm his power, first as president, and then as

emperor. The machinery of the ballot-box rendered such an appeal possible. But that mechanism pre-supposes conditions which would have precluded success in earlier times. It involves a capacity to read and write in the majority of the people, and it requires that speedy circulation of intelligence which modern facilities, such as printing and rapidity of communication, have alone afforded. It involves above all, to insure success, such a standard of moral and political rectitude amongst the people, and such a submission to the requirements of the law, that the inviolability of the ballot-box shall be secured. We have introduced the same principle in this colony to a limited extent,—not indeed in the general Government, but in that of municipalities. We appeal by a plebiscitum to the ratepayers, to sanction loans proposed to be raised by boroughs; and, more recently, we ascertain the wishes of the people on the subject of increasing or not increasing the number of public houses in a district.

It is clear that this extension of the principle of democracy is within the possibilities of the future in free Governments; and, in respect to one class of subjects, its utility and propriety will hardly be disputed. It has often been argued that the body entrusted with the duty of making laws for ordinary purposes of government is not necessarily clothed with the power of altering the fundamental principles of the Constitution. This position was taken by Mr. Grattan and those who opposed the union of Ireland with Great Britain; and constitutional lawyers of high position maintained the same view. The name of Lord Plunkett alone is sufficient authority for claiming great weight to the arguments adduced:—that a parliament elected by the people to make laws for their government cannot exceed the powers confided to it;—is incapable, morally and constitutionally, of putting an end to its own existence, and can, in the extreme case, but restore to the people the trust which the people confided to its hands. This important principle was asserted by the framers of the Constitution of the United States, the fifth article of which provides that any alteration in the Constitution shall be made only by a convention of the people, whose decisions become a part of the constitutional law, only after adoption by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States, or by conventions of three-fourth of the States, as Congress should determine; and the Constitution itself was only brought into force by being accepted by a convention in each of the thirteen States, elected for the sole purpose of determining, aye or no, the acceptance of the new Constitution. In England it has always been held that in the king, lords and commons in parliament assembled are vested full power to alter the Constitution; but it has also been asserted that, where any fundamental alteration in the Constitution is proposed, parliament should be dissolved, and an election should take place with a special view to the determination of the question. Thus the people would, for all practical purposes, have been consulted, and legislation would proceed in compliance with their will. Still it can hardly be denied that a direct appeal to the people would be a more satisfactory method of asserting the principle, which is in fact admitted by the argument I have just noticed; and would relieve the Legislature from those long and violent discussions which always occur when any fundamental alteration in the Constitution of a State is proposed.

How far this process of appealing directly to the masses may become incorporated into the practice of Governments, it is impossible to speculate; still less to predicate what might be the results. I have gone *no* further than to indicate it as not undesirable, in questions where there are grounds for doubting whether the Legislature is not trenching on the limits of its Constitutional powers. But this at least may be said, that the modern contrivance of the vote by ballot renders that possible, which could not otherwise be obtained without the risk which always attends the assembly of great masses of the people in times of popular excitement, and the difficulty of ascertaining with accuracy, in the confusion of public meetings, the real voices of those entitled to vote.

I have occupied your time in this brief sketch of the growth of government for the purpose of calling attention to this fact: that the aspect of government in the present day is different from what it has ever been, so far as we know, at any previous period; that it is only within, comparatively speaking, the few past years that the mass of the people, without any underlying substratum such as slavery, have become a predominant power; and that by the machinery of election and representation that power is now exercised without turmoil or violence, but peaceably and effectively. Step by step franchises have been lowered, until manhood suffrage has been reached in some countries, and is rapidly approaching in others; and even universal suffrage, that is a suffrage including women, is largely and ably advocated.

The momentous question for the future is—now that power has passed or is passing into the hands of the masses,—What will they do with it?

The history of the present century has been one of what may be termed specially *political* strife; the main attention of statesmen has been given to questions relating to the redistribution of the balance of political power between the different classes; and on this platform political parties, and their outcome, party government, have been formed. But with the final adjustment of that question, with a franchise enjoyed by all classes equally, political agitation must cease, and party government disappear. Other matters must occupy the arena. The power once securely lodged with the people, to what purpose will they use it? That is the problem of the future.

Political power is not an end; it is only a means to an end. It needs little sagacity to predict that the improvement of the social and physical condition of the people will monopolise the thought and mould the action of the governments of the future. Social reform will take the place of political.

We may predicate so much, not only from forecasting the probabilities of the future, but from a survey of what has already taken place even in the few years of the present reign. Just as the increasing pressure of the public mind has been felt on government, so has the spirit of administration changed its character, in the direction of ameliorating the conditions of life, and softening the asperity with which laws, framed in ruder stages of society, pressed upon the people. The alterations in the criminal law, the treatment of criminals, the spirit in which the law of libel is interpreted, the care of lunatics, the management of hospitals, the provisions for public health both in towns and in country districts, the drainage of unhealthy localities, the extension of popular education—all these are matters which have received an amount of attention in the last few years which has never before been accorded to them. And, in addition, the inventions of modern science, such as railroads and telegraphs, have forced upon Government new duties and responsibilities, all tending towards the same end,—the improvement in the physical and social conditions of life amongst the great masses of the population.

And this brings us to the question so often asked,—What are the limits within which the duties of Government lie? and what are those which ought to be left—to use a common expression—to private enterprise? A question never satisfactorily answered, because public opinion, reflected in or led by the views of statesmen, is undergoing a gradual but great change in this matter. It used to be thought that the only duty of Government was to collect the revenue required for the support of its power and dignity, to maintain order in the community, to provide for the due administration of the laws, to guide the nation in its action in relation to foreign States, and to maintain the national religious institutions of the country: that all interference with matters of a commercial character should be left to the private enterprise of its citizens. Nay further, it was argued that any interference by Government in other matters tended to impair the spirit of independence in a people, and to cripple the energy of individual exertion. No one will deny that there is a truth underlying this view. To have everything done for us by a sort of beneficent despotism, instead of being compelled to the wholesome exertion of doing it for ourselves, no doubt tends to emasculate the energy and to enfeeble the self-reliance of a people. But how if the people are themselves the Government, or the basis on which the Government rests, and in obedience to whose behests it lives and moves and has its being? It is clear that the old doctrine is one transmitted to us from ages, when Governments were regarded as something above and outside of, and often opposed to the people, instead of being in and of them. One of the most striking features of modern times is the extension of trade and manufactures by means of companies of share-holders. Do we consider that individual energy is repressed in shareholders, by their confiding the management of the concern for which they have associated themselves to directors whom they select for the purpose? Surely no one will say so.

The question then is,—Does not Government, exactly in proportion as it becomes more and more a reflection of the popular will, assume more and more the position of a directory of a company, in which every citizen is a shareholder? and if this is so, what then are the limits within which the action of Government should be confined? Let us consider for a moment the extent to which the old idea of Government has already been violated in all free States; that is to say, the matters in which Government engages, which might be left to private enterprise. Take the post office for example. There are companies for carrying goods and parcels and delivering them in towns and in the country. And what is the difference between a hater and a parcel? But no one will dispute that by the creation of a national organization for distributing letters, an immense benefit is conferred on the whole community. And yet can it be denied that Government not only interferes in this matter with private enterprise, but does so to the utmost extent, by vesting in itself a close monopoly, and debarring by penalties the competition of private persons? Take again the post office money order system, in which *the* Government competes with the bankers in the business of transmitting money; or the savings banks, in which it goes into the market against a multitude of private companies. I might also instance the case of railroads; which in this, as in many other countries, are Government monopolies; and are managed with at least as great satisfaction to the public as those which are still in the hands of private companies. Still more aptly may I quote the instance of telegraphs, which, in Great Britain, were bought by the State, after the experiment had been tried for some years of their management as private speculations; and it is, I believe, admitted that they are now managed by the Government with as much success and with as much benefit to the public as when they were in private hands. The Government Insurance Office, and the Public Trust Office are instances in which we in this colony have carried the same principle to a step further than has been elsewhere attempted, and, so far as I am aware, without any complaint against the establishment or the management of those institutions. And it is not only in the general government that this new principle has been asserted; for it has been still further extended in the subordinate or local governments; for instance, in the supply of gas, water, and tramways in towns, which are often provided by the municipality, the whole of the inhabitants being taxed for the purpose.

It is evident, then, that the old definition of the duty of Government fails to include much of what is now generally admitted to be within its proper functions:—that the realm of private enterprise has been invaded at many points; and *that* with the greatest benefit to the people. Take for example the supply of water. A private company would probably only supply it in such quarters as would prove remunerative. But in the hands of the governing body, it would be supplied equally to all classes; not only sub-serving the luxury of the rich, but bringing to the poorest home that which is a necessary condition of health and comfort. Seeing then the extent to which Government has already intruded into the territory of private enterprise, the question forces itself upon all who speculate on the possibilities of the future, to what extent may not the citizens of each State be beneficially associated in a common organization for special purposes?

In the existing organization of society two great underlying principles are at work, pointing in opposite directions, and in distinct hostility the one to the other. I mean *competition* and *communism*. Competition claims that the interests of society are best subserved, by relying upon the instinct of human nature which impels each individual to acquire as much as possible for himself. It finds expression in the old proverbs "Self preservation is the first law of nature"—"Charity begins at home"—"God helps him most who helps himself" and such like. It regards success as the natural and predestinated reward of superior strength or skill, sagacity, foresight, or cunning; and in these days it appeals to a new sanction, derived from the all-pervading law of organic life, now generally accepted, that nature operates by "the survival of the fittest" and its advocates may well ask in the words of Scotland's bard,

*"Why then ask of silly man
To oppose great nature's plan."*

It asserts further, that, in the universal struggle of all for superiority, the self-reliance, endurance, skill, and prudence of every individual are sharpened and strengthened; that the result is a general increase in the products of human labour, and a necessary increase in the prosperity of the whole community; and it takes credit for a still further advantage, in that, by the competition between rival producers and distributors, articles of consumption are supplied to the people at a lower price than can be attained by any other method. Against this theory, communism wages perpetual war: and in using this ominous word, you will understand that I mean, not only or principally the ultimate development of the principle, which demands the abolition of all individual property—which says with Prudhorhe "property is robbery," and claims that all wealth shall be held by the community at large, each individual enjoying an equal share of its use; but I embrace in the term all arrangements whereby men associate themselves for common objects, and to which the milder name of *co-operation* is applied. Co-operation is no more than a partial adoption by one section of the people, and for a special purpose, of that which communism would apply to the whole, and for every purpose in the organisation of society. Communism was attempted in the first formation of the Christian Church, and was adopted in supposed compliance with the will of its Founder. We all know how the experiment first displayed its inherent weakness, in the dishonesty of some of the members. And even those who have no hostility to the extreme doctrine in theory, can hardly fail to perceive how inapplicable it is to human nature in its existing phase. Surely all but the most visionary must admit, that community of goods can only exist in a people amongst whom coexists a corresponding community of character and feeling, of principle and of honor, of motives and impulses,—a people trained to an entire abnegation of self, and possessing an all pervading faith in one another. Some of us may indulge in the dream, that such may be the final consummation of human society; that to such an end the destinies of our race are surely though slowly tending; but we must also perceive that community of goods, as a universal rule, will be the *result* not the *cause* of that refinement and elevation in the moral condition of mankind, without which it cannot exist.

No sane thinker on these matters can believe that communism in its furthest development, could be suddenly or violently imposed with any hope of practical success, upon men who have for long ages been trained in the opposite belief, and all whose conceptions have been moulded on other principles. Social systems are things of growth. They may be violently broken up by convulsions; but even then the new principles do not for a long time take abiding root in the national character. How soon did not England return from the republican to the old monarchical idea. It is now a century since the French Revolution, yet how recently have republican principles prevailed in that country. How short a time elapsed after the declaration of the rights of man, before France relapsed into the old forms under the new name of Empire; and distributed, as the prizes of successful conquest, the wealth and honors and titles, which it had destroyed as the possession of proscriptive right and ancient lineage. It was the old world story. The emancipated slaves, under the burden and hard training of unaccustomed freedom, sighed once more for the fleshpots of Egypt.

But what cannot be effected by sudden and violent change may be approached by the slow but irresistible

growth of popular feeling, especially when awakened by the teaching of those who have applied great information and power of thought to the investigation of the causes of the unequal distribution of the comforts and conveniences, not to say the necessities of life, amongst different classes and individuals. And such is one remarkable feature of the literature of the present day. Such too is the tendency of those institutions of which so many have sprung up in the last twenty or thirty years, the co-operative clubs, and the still older Friendly Societies, and the older yet associations of Trades Unions. All these are separate and isolated endeavors, tending, in special spheres, to the same end as that which communism aims at applying to the entire organization of society; and they are based on the same great underlying principle which inspires the faith of the communist. Under the influence of these institutions the public mind is being schooled and educated, no less by their failures than by their successes; is learning the true principles, so far as they can be said to be established, of political economy—of the laws which regulate the creation and distribution of wealth; is being taught, above all, how much it is possible to achieve, consistently with the existing moral and mental condition of men; and, at the same time, by the reaction which wholesome exertion exercises upon the human faculties rightly used, is being elevated and trained to an extent which may render it capable of wider and more beneficent applications of the principles which inspired its earliest efforts.

Let us clearly understand the difference between the two principles of which I am speaking. The doctrine of competition is based on the belief that the mainspring of human action is self-interest; communism, in the faith that it is, or ought to be, the subordination of self-interest to the sense of human brotherhood. Competition looks mainly to production; and, deeming it proved that the progress of society depends on the advance of its powers of production, infers that the national prosperity must be the inevitable result. Communism looks rather to distribution; and asserts that, whatever may be the power of production, where the results are monopolised by the few, whilst a large section of the mass is left in destitution, society on the whole is not progressing but retrograding. From the stand-point of the present, it may be difficult to gather from the observations we are able to make on the infinitely complicated machine of society moving around us, what may be the outcome of the opposing forces at work; but from a moral point of view, from the principles of eternal right and wrong which are implanted in the human breast, we may judge of the character of the two principles of which I am speaking, and may determine which ought to tend, and unless all social organization is a piece of disjointed and inharmonious mechanism, must tend, to the advancement, the happiness, and the prosperity of a nation.

Which, then, is the nobler instinct of the two,—the law of self-interest, or the law of brotherhood? Test it by an extreme case. Let us suppose that some of us are cast adrift upon a raft in mid ocean; that there is but a limited supply of food and water; that the only hope of safety lies in being picked up by some passing ship before our supplies are exhausted. Shall we deem that a fulfilment of the highest duty of man, which would impel the strong to cast the weak to the sharks, so that their own chances of life might thereby be prolonged? Or shall we be ashamed of the weakness under which our breasts have sometimes heaved with emotion and our eyes filled with tears, when hearing, as we have sometimes heard, how the strongest and roughest seaman of the company has deprived himself of the portion which was his equal share, and waved from his burning lips the last drop of water, that he might alleviate in some measure the sufferings—perchance add something to the desperate chance of life—of the feeblest woman or the tenderest child with whom he was bound in a companionship of suffering. Shall we say that this is a strained or unfair test of what is noble or base in human action? Are we not all, each generation in its turn, adrift on the raft of time amidst the boundless ocean of eternity, with the same duty imposed on us, if not to share alike, at least to provide that the monopoly of comfort and luxury by the few does not condemn the many to suffering and destitution? How then can we refuse our admiration at the motives which have induced the Trades Unions to set their face against piece work or other means by which the stronger and more skilful workman can by working longer and more expeditiously, earn higher wages than his fellows? They may be wrong; it may be that the course they take would frustrate, not advance their object; but the impulse which moves them to determine that, where there is only a given amount of work to be done, and more men than are necessary to do it, they shall all share and share alike, this surely is dictated by a motive which appeals to the noblest and most heroic instincts of the human breast.

Among the manifold developments of the doctrine of competition, I will notice one, in the system of contracts, upon which the largest part of all undertakings, by private persons and companies, and also by Governments are carried on; until it has come to exercise a great influence on the organization of society. It has grown up out of the necessity, that, where works require the organized labor of large numbers of workmen, they should be directed and superintended by someone having skill and experience in the description of undertaking required. It is rightly assumed that such an overseer will apply the labor at his disposal in the most efficient manner. But it is further assumed that, by inviting public tenders, the work will be done in the cheapest manner for the employers if the lowest tender is taken. But what are the grounds for such an assumption? The cost of a work is a fact. With a known market price of materials, and of the current rate of wages at the time, a

work will cost just the same, whether done by a contractor or by an employer. It is quite true that the employer has the advantage of knowing exactly, or thinks he knows exactly, what his utmost outlay will be; and, where he is ignorant of the mode of the execution himself, he thus insures himself against loss; but, as a matter of fact, the work costs the same. If the contract price is less than that, the contractor loses; if more, he gains, and often gains enormously, very much more than the fair value of his labor and skill in superintendence. That this is so the enormous fortunes made by many contractors in all countries clearly prove. The workmen do not work more skilfully or harder for the contractor than they would for the employer. Why should they do so? They have no motive that I can see. The laborer or mechanic works his best, in order, by acquiring a good character in his trade, to secure constant employment and higher wages. Again, it is assumed that it is impossible to obtain the services of competent superintendents, who will honestly consult the employers' interests, at a fixed rate of wages; and that such men would display more skill and energy if working for their own pockets than if working for an employer. But surely the overseer has the same motive to establish a character for skill and management which the workman has, namely, the desire to prove himself the best man who can be found in his trade. It is idle to say that honest and skilful overseers are not to be procured for fair salaries, whilst we employ multitudes of superintendents in various classes of industry upon wages, not by contract. We do not let out our railways to be worked by a general manager by contract, or employ captains by contract to sail our ships; and yet in these and a thousand other cases, we require the experience and skill necessary in the application of organized labor; and the work in railway workshops, and in dockyards and arsenals is as well and as cheaply done as any that a contractor can produce. But the vice of the contract system is that it makes it the direct interest of the contractor to act unfairly by the employer. His profits depend upon the cheapness with which he can get the work done. If he can get inferior material at a lower price, or hire less skilful labour at a lower rate, that is so much in his pocket; and to prevent his doing so, we employ engineers, and architects, and clerks of the works, to see that we get the worth of our money; so that our protection, after all, is in the hired servant, not in the contractor. To put it broadly,—we make it the contractor's interest to cheat us. I am far from saying that he always does so. I willingly bear witness to the honesty and liberality of many contractors with whom I have been brought in contact. And the more honor to those who, in spite of the temptation to which the system exposes them, do really honestly carry out their contracts even at their own loss. But the frequent disputes which arise at the conclusion of contracts, evidence on the other hand the unsatisfactory character of the bargain. Again, such is the looseness of the terms in which contracts are often, and sometimes unavoidably, drawn up, that the contractor can generally speculate on necessary accessories to the work, for which he can charge as extras, and so supplement any deficiency in his tender for what is included in the specification. Singularly enough, in one large class of employment—I mean the collection of revenue—the practice of farming the revenues, that is of letting the collection of them out by contract, is an expedient which has long been abandoned by all but semi-barbarous States. In civilized countries it has been found that the system of employing paid servants in this branch of labor is, beyond all comparison, cheaper than the contract system.

I have taken this as one instance of the manner in which the application of the doctrine of competition operates to distribute the produce of labour with enormous inequality, and to produce a natural feeling of discontent amongst the masses. I am quite aware of the arguments put forward by modern writers, especially in that most remarkable work on "Progress and Poverty" by Mr. George, to prove that the possession of land by private individuals is the sole cause of the unequal distribution of wealth. But I confess myself to be unable to perceive why the monopoly of large estates in land should give one man the power to grasp an unfair proportion of the produce of labor, whilst the same evil should not arise from a similar monopoly of capital. It may be quite true, and no doubt is, that, in the war between labour and capital, the attention of those who are suffering from the existing condition of society has been mainly fixed on the monopoly of capital, and has overlooked the perhaps still greater evil caused by the monopoly of land; but to attribute no ill effect to the former seems to me to overstate the case as against land. The truth is that the monopoly of capital is a more patent fact presented to the view of the working classes. It is not unnatural that the labourer should regard the possession of great landed estate which has been handed down for generations as the heritage of a noble family, if not without a feeling of envy, still without active hostility; especially when relations of a kindly and beneficent character have existed between the fortunate possessor of wealth and the poor around him, which have been equally handed down from the ancestors on both sides; and the people may well fail to trace the cause of the increasing hardness of their lot, in arrangements which, so far as they can see, have been unchanged for generations. But far differently must they view the unequal division of the new wealth which is being daily created around them, by the labor of their own hands. When Tom and Harry, two stalwart youths, are working in a railway cutting at the age of eighteen, and twenty years after Tom is still using his pick and filling his barrow, whilst Harry drives by in his coach, and looks down on his former mate from the earthly paradise of half a million of money, can we be surprised that Tom and his friends should ask with some discontent,—why is this?—what is the secret of this complex machine of society, with its sacred rights of

property, and its hard maxims of political economy, which permits, nay encourages, the absorption of the produce of the labor of all, into the hands of the few;—too often into the hands of men in no way pre-eminent above their fellows in any of those qualities which he has been taught to respect as deserving the esteem and homage of mankind. Those who argue, as Mr. George does, that the real contest is not between labor and capital, but between labor and rent of land—that capital is not advanced by the capitalist to set labour in motion, but that it is really advanced by the labourer to the capitalist, because the former gives the produce of his labour to the latter, before he gets his wages,—have started a proposition which may or may not be theoretically true, but which does not, in its application, fit into or account for the phenomena of actual life. If a large manufacturing establishment stops payment, and hundreds of men are suddenly thrown out of employment and their families are brought to the brink of starvation, how can you persuade those who are exposed to such suffering, that the withdrawal of the source of their weekly wages, that is of the capital which has been lost, is not the proximate cause of their distress? Or how can you expect them not to believe that the aggregation of vast capital in the hands of one man, does not invest the owner with an enormous power for weal or woe over the fortunes and lives of his fellow creatures? Practically it does so. The political economist may be right; on the whole and in the long run, the facts may fit themselves to the theory. But there is one all important fact which is left out of consideration; namely, that a man must have food to live, and that if for a very few days he is deprived of food he dies. The capital lost by one has only passed into other hands. The labor must, in some fashion or other, follow it. But the transition is only effected with great misery, and often with loss of life. Water, we know, always tends to assume a level surface. But the water at one bank of a river will often be found higher than at the opposite bank. Why? because the element of time intervenes; it has not had time to distribute itself, that is, to adjust the fact to the law. And so it is in human affairs; but with this difference, that if the water does not find its level in a given time it does not die, and the man does.

You perceive I am arguing that the doctrine of the older writers, from Adam Smith downwards is, in its practical application to the circumstances of society, not to be set aside; and that capital must be regarded as the agent for setting labor in motion; and hence that the popular view, that the accumulation of vast hords of capital in few hands, with all the incidental power with which it invests its possessor over the lives and happiness of a large part of his fellow creatures, is a great and patent evil in a State—that this view, I say, is one founded on a truth which cannot be set aside. This being so, the remedy seems to lie in the direction of a more even distribution of capital amongst the community; not by violent spoliation of the rich and division of existing wealth amongst the poor, which would effect no more than a temporary change without affecting the cause of the evil, but by such adjustments of the economical machinery, that is, of the artificial arrangements we have made as regards property, that wealth shall naturally tend to distribute itself, instead of to accumulate in heaps.

It is common to hear it said these things should be left to the free working of economical law;—that the State should not interfere. But the State has always interfered. It formerly allowed the combination of employers, whilst it made the combination of employed criminal. In a multitude of ways in olden time it tried, both directly and indirectly, to force down wages, and to encourage the monopoly of wealth. The spirit of legislation has, indeed, to a great extent changed. Trades union combinations are no longer illegal. Friendly Societies and Savings Banks are under the patronage of the State. The great question for the future is, in what way and to what extent can the State encourage and stimulate the movement by which working men may become shareholders in industrial enterprises, and so become the recipients both of wages and profits?—to what extent can co-operation be aided by, or even be absorbed into the duties of Government?—to what extent can the vast accretions of wealth arising from all that a nation annually produces over and above what it consumes, instead of being poured into private tanks, be conducted into one great national reservoir, and held in trust for the benefit of the people by whose labor it has been created?

In railways which belong to a Government, this is already done to the fullest extent. Every taxpayer in the country is a shareholder in the company by which they are managed. It is on the security of the taxpayers that the capital has been borrowed to construct them. If your railways do not produce, in net profits, enough to pay the interest on the debt, the balance has to be paid by taxation. If the net profits exceed that interest, the money goes directly into all our pockets; because taxation for other purposes of Government can be remitted to an equal amount. A Government railway system is, in fact, nothing more than a large co-operative society in which every taxpayer is a shareholder, and shares the profits, or has to pay the losses by calls under the name of taxes.

A Government Insurance office is a somewhat similar institution applied to one section of the community instead of the whole; that is, to those only who voluntarily associate themselves. But there is this distinction. In a State Insurance office on the mutual principle, the profits are periodically divided amongst the insurers, not amongst the taxpayers; whereas if the office is guaranteed by the State, any loss, were any possible, would have to be made up by the taxpayers, most of whom have no interest in the concern. In this respect the plan of compulsory insurance proposed by the Rev. Mr. Blackley, which has been submitted for the consideration of

this colony by our Government, is devoid of the inconsistency I have just pointed out; because, all being insured alike, all would share equally the risks and profits;—the profits in this case, being the allowance in case of sickness or accident, and the annuity after a certain period of life. I can conceive no form of co-operation more sound in principle or more entirely beneficial to a community than such a scheme, if carefully adjusted to the circumstances of the people in which it was in force.

Another form in which capital is accumulated in few hands is in the business of banking. Might not banking be more usefully carried on by the State, that is by the whole community as a co-operative concern, than by private persons or companies? It is generally supposed that banking requires capital. This is a mistake. Banks have been carried on successfully for long years without any capital. I can remember two instances in which, when failure having occurred in exceptionally bad times, it was proved that the bank had lost all its capital many years before. In fact, the dictum of an old country banker I remember was true, that if a man could not carry on a bank without capital, he did not understand his business. The simplest form of banking is where the banker invests the money placed in his hands in the public funds, retaining only so much in his safe as will meet the current calls over the counter. Thus, if his current deposits are £500,000, and £50,000 is sufficient for current demand, he can invest £450,000 in the funds, and live on the interest. The only capital he requires, is to recoup any loss arising from a fall in Government stock if he is compelled to sell out; and even that a prudent banker would have provided for by saving a rest out of his income. The only difference in the modern process of banking is, that the banker lends the money to private persons, instead of to the State, in the form of bills and overdrafts for which he takes security. He only fails, where he invests his money on bad security or in forms in which it is not readily available for conversion in case of extraordinary current demands. When we read of such large dividends being paid on the shares in bank stock, it must be remembered that these dividends are not the produce of the bank's capital only, but of all the money lent to it by depositors. The capital may be only a million; the current deposits may be live millions. The produce of the latter, invested at small interest, will allow of a very large interest being paid on the former. But under a system of a State bank, the bank would be a co-operative society in which the profits would belong to all the depositors. I can see no reason why such a bank should not exist, in which all the depositors should be dealt with as shareholders, each being credited with interest on his daily balance, or his average daily balance at longer periods, the interest being altered from time to time as the necessities of the bank required, so that on the whole no profit to the bank should accrue. If at the accounting period the assets were in excess, that would prove that a larger interest might safely have been credited to the depositors; if they were deficient, that interest had been fixed at too high a rate. An alteration in the rate of interest would adjust the account. The gain to the community would be,—first that the profits on the depositors money would go to the depositors instead of to a body of shareholders: and secondly, that the wide-spread misery the disturbance of trade in all its ramifications, and the great incidental loss extending through remote classes and interests, which always follow a bank failure, would be rendered impossible. The wealth of the whole community would be the guarantee of the bank's safety, and capital in the ordinary sense would be unnecessary to the management of its affairs. And I have no doubt that under such an institution the facilities of banking would be vastly extended, and would be taken advantage of by a stratum of society to which they are not at present available;—to such an extent indeed that the necessity of savings banks would be altogether superseded. By the ordinary system of fixed deposits, the national bank would fulfil all the functions of the savings bank for the people.

Here again the old objection would start up,—There would be no security that the affairs of the bank would be conducted with prudence, sagacity and skill. But what security is there at present? We are told the motive of self interest: that the shareholders are certain to look after their money. But have we not recently had some startling examples of the contrary? The truth is that the shareholders rely on the directors; and the directors must rely on the fidelity and ability of the paid managers, who have no interest in the concern except their salaries, and their prospect of promotion by the exhibition of honest and capability; and why those qualities should be found in the service of private persons only, and not in the service of the State, I am unable to see; the more so that I do see, as a fact, vast concerns conducted by all Governments, in which agents possessed of the necessary qualifications are not difficult to find. This, then, is only one of many directions in which it seems to me possible that Governments may aid in applying the principle of co-operation to embrace the whole community, and may impose a barrier in the way of a mischievous monopoly of wealth in private hands.

But here I must notice an objection not without weight. It is said that under our system of Government by representative chambers, and responsible ministers who are the organs of political parties, influences of a political character would be felt in the management of undertakings of a commercial nature, which would impair their utility. I do not deny it. Railways might possibly be managed, not for the interest of the railways or the public, but for party purposes. A State Bank might be converted into a most potent engine of party. I see the danger of this. But I see the remedy. It lies in a comprehension of the most ancient principles of the Constitution. What is usually called the *Government*, that is the ministry of the day, is not entrusted, according

to our constitution, with more than a limited part of the powers of the State. The laws are not administered by the *political* Government, but by the judicial. And well did the great founders of the American Commonwealth comprehend the value of that principle, when they kept the judicial functions distinct from the political, and, in some respects, extended the powers of the former at the expense of the latter. For example, the Courts of law in England cannot set aside an Act of Parliament. They can only interpret it. But the Supreme Court of the United States can declare an Act of Congress null and void, as having been passed *ultra vires*. If, then, the administration of one large part of the functions and powers of the Government as a whole, are not entrusted to the administrative or political Government, where lies the difficulty in handing over the powers of the State, in what may be called its commercial capacity, to bodies outside of, and beyond the influence of the political Government? If we hold, as we all do, that the great bulwark of our liberties lies even less in franchises and popular government, than in the independence of the Courts of law, both of the Crown on one hand and of the people on the other, would it not be equally not only wise but necessary, and equally in accordance with the whole spirit of the Constitution, that the administration of the Government in its commercial character should, in a similar way, be protected from influences which could not fail to be mischievous, and should be vested in independent authorities, specially adapted to secure the success of the undertakings committed to their charge?

The last subject to which I will call your attention is that of possible changes in the nature of landed property. It is very remarkable how clearly the evil of the monopoly of land was foreseen by the first Jewish law givers. In the code of law which we find in the book of Leviticus, the law of Jubilee enacted that all lands sold should revert to the original proprietors or their heirs on the day of Jubilee, which occurred every fifty years. Thus the owner could only dispose of his patrimony virtually by lease, for the unexpired term ending on the next Jubilee day. The tendency to the aggregation of large landed estates was no doubt as great then as now, and would have been more severely felt in a small country, little larger than the Canterbury plains in this colony; and the wise provision for the periodical re-distribution of the land may be looked on as one principal cause of the vast increase in the population and wealth of Palestine, which took place up to the time of Soloman; nor can it be regarded as fanciful to say that the neglect of this law may have been one of the causes of the gradual dissolution of the Hebrew Commonwealth. For when the prophet Jeremiah bought a piece of land just before the captivity, in order to prove his own conviction of the truth of his prophecy of the restoration of the Jews to their land after seventy years, whilst under the Mosaic law, the sale would have been by that time annulled, we must conclude that the law of Jubilee, as affecting land, had become obsolete.

That all lands were, in early times, held in commonalty as the property of the State is now sufficiently established. That, as settlement on land for agricultural uses took the place of nomadic habits and the pursuit of the chase, private and personal rights intruded themselves into the communistic title, there can be no doubt. Under the Feudal system the land was vested in the Crown, and was held by the tenant, originally for service, which was subsequently commuted into payment in money. But before many generations had passed away, the interest of the tenant gradually exterminated the communistic title of the State. The history of the law of real property is one of a persistent encroachment of private upon public right, until at length the right of private property in land acquired a sort of sanctity superior even to that which was attributed to personality. But it is clear that the national title was never wholly abandoned, nor, had the monarch been in reality, as he was in theory, the trustee and guardian of the public estate for the benefit of the whole community, would, perhaps, such encroachments have been tolerated. But this great change in the idea of private property in land took place in ages when the interests of the great feudatories were paramount, and the mass of the people had but a feeble perception of their rights, and little or no influence on the action of the governing powers. The vast confiscations of lands which, in troublous times, extended over so large a part of England, and over the largest part of Ireland,—the resumption of the lands of the monasteries and abbeys by Henry VIII, and in our own time of the property of the Irish Church,—were all more or less assertions on the part of the State of the ancient right to deal with land as public property; and traces of the same doctrine still find,—or till very recently found, expression in existing law. That, in the case of intestacy without an heir, the land reverts to the Crown—that the same rule is applied to the estates of those convicted of certain crimes, and attainted in blood,—the laws of mortmain and entail—the inability to convey land to the subject of a foreign State,—all bear witness to the vitality of the ancient idea, that private property in land only exists subject to such conditions and restrictions as the State may think fit to impose. And within the present century States have begun to resume to a further extent their old rights, by asserting the power to take lands without the consent of the proprietors, for public purposes; especially for railways; paying, it is true, compensation, but still asserting the principle that the public right must overrule all private rights in the proprietorship of the soil. And writers have now appeared who advocate the exercise of the same right, on the same grounds, that is the public necessities, to the extent that the State should resume the ownership of the entire soil of the country, and hold it in trust for the people at large. Some, such as Mr. George, to whose work I have already alluded, deny all claim to compensation on the part of the present owners; some, as Mr. Wallace, admit a claim for compensation, and would satisfy it in the form of a

life annuity to the existing proprietors, and their immediate heirs, and, if necessary would extend it to a third generation. All writers agree that the improvements on land made by occupiers should belong to the tenant; but whilst some maintain that the State should resume the land itself, that is to say, the rent of the unimproved value, others go only so far as to claim for the State the unearned increment, that is to say, that part of the value which has arisen from the general progress and prosperity of the community, over and above the original or natural value which it may be supposed to have been worth,

But whatever view we take as to the right of the State to resume the ownership of the soil, there remains the question of its expediency. Will such a policy produce the beneficial results promised? And again, are the evils such as to justify the application of so drastic a remedy! I confess myself unable to accept Mr. George's conclusion, so far at least as I have been able to consider the subject, that all the ills arising from the vast inequality in the distribution of wealth would be at once remedied by a resumption of the ownership of the land by the State; or to perceive the justice of the distinction he draws between the monopoly of land and of other forms of wealth as the only cause of those evils. For the purpose of this argument, land appears to me to have the same effect on the social system as any other form of wealth; and, if I assented to the doctrine of the abolition of private ownership, it would be because the more equal distribution of wealth amongst the different sections and individuals of society, appears a result which must in some fashion be achieved, unless the whole fabric of modern civilization is to be permitted to crumble into the dust. In this view the aggregation of large tracts of country in private hands should be subjected to the same restrictions which should be applied to wealth of whatever kind. I have only called your attention to this as one amongst the other burning questions which must before long occupy the minds of statesmen during the next generation. But I may point out that the recent legislation on the subject of the land in Ireland has greatly hastened the period when the question must be brought to a practical issue. That measure seems to me to be a final abandonment on the part of the British Government of the doctrine hitherto thought to be beyond the pale of discussion—the inviolability of the right of private property in land. The new land law for Ireland does without question admit the principle that it is within the power of the Legislature to partition the property in the soil between the landlord and the tenant, that it takes the land out of the category of those things which are the subject of free bargain, regulated by the ordinary law of supply and demand; and, more than all, that it does this without recognising any claim to compensation on the part of the landlord. Confiscation has been for ages the basis of title to a great part of the soil of Ireland; but it has been the confiscation of the property of the rich to give to the rich; now for the first time it is the confiscation of part of the property of the rich to bestow it on the poor. Idle indeed it is not to foresee the influence which the principle asserted by this law must have in the future discussion of this important question.

In conclusion, I have endeavoured to call your attention to some of the demands which may possibly be made on future Governments, because the phenomena of the present day indicate the approach of an epoch, which may be one of momentous consequence to the civilized world; phenomena which force on us the question—In what direction are we really moving? I have read that in one attempt which was made by the late Sir Edward Parry to reach the North Pole, by means of boats, used as sledges where no open water was to be found, as the seamen were toiling over the icefields, and dragging the boats at a rate which seemed to promise a successful termination to the expedition, the observation of the Commander shewed that their real position was, day by day, further south than on the day before. To the superficial view of the seaman he was travelling to the north; the higher knowledge disclosed the truth that the whole icefield was bearing him to the southward, faster than his wearied footsteps traversed its surface to the north. And may not this be our own case; May it not be that, dazzled by the glitter of the enormous wealth which is increasing with such amazing rapidity around us,—ministered to in every want by the stupendous powers of nature, which are being evoked from their secret recesses to be chained to our chariot wheels—may not we blindly fancy that we are building up an enduring structure of imperishable prosperity, whilst we are really underlaying the foundations with subterranean forces, which, sooner or later, may shatter our palaces to atoms? How can we close our ears to the warning voices which, like the unheeded utterances of the prophets of old, tell us that our civilisation is rotten to the core; that its only result is, that whilst the rich are growing ever richer the poor are growing ever poorer? What can we say of a social system which is powerless to solve an economical problem except by the inhuman machinery of *the strike*; a machinery which at once paralyses "the might that slumbers in the peasant's arm," and crushes, with equal and pitiless cruelty, the tenderness of maternity and the innocence of childhood? What shall we say to the incomprehensible phenomenon, that the Irish peasantry, with a population of five millions, are in the same state of misery and destitution as they were thirty or forty years ago, with a population of eight millions, whilst the wealth of the country has more than doubled? How do we explain the fact that whole districts in Scotland which were once the home of a strong and well fed race of hardy mountaineers, are now only the haunts of the wild deer and game which minister to the sport and luxury of the rich?—forgetful of the truth which revealed itself to the poet, though ignored by the economist,

*"Ill fares the land to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates, while men decay."*

Or what, again, is the solution of the mystery that, after so many years of the boasted beneficence of our rule over India—the rule of the mightiest and wealthiest nation on the earth—periodical famine still stalks over the rice fields of Hindostan, mowing down in its ghastly stride more human victims than the car of Juggernaut or the sword of the ruthless despots whose rule we have replaced?

What well grounded belief have we that this stupendous fabric of modern civilization of which we boast is destined to be more enduring than those of which the shattered monuments alone tell us of their existence and their extirmination? They fell—some we know—all we may confidently believe, because, in the fierce competition for wealth, and the insatiable lust for power, the moral elements which knit together all human society were dissolved; the luxury of the rich became licentiousness; the degradation of the poor wrought crime and lawlessness; wealth became the agent, and poverty the victim of corruption; the ties of home and the fires of patriotism were drowned in the rising flood of anarchy, and the seething mass preyed on itself until swept away by some stronger race;—some race which, though apparently of ruder and less matured social organization, was yet closely united by the strong affinity of its individual atoms; compact by the love of kindred and the pride of race; strong in the instinct of brotherhood and faith in one another, in ail the true and only elements of enduring national greatness. And it is not enough to tell us that the poor are better off than they were, because the rate of wages is higher, and the price of food and clothing lower than formerly. You can measure lengths by a two-foot rule if you know that your two-foot rule remains unchanged: but to measure things in different ages by a standard which is itself constantly fluctuating from age to age, this is but a deceptive process. No one who knows anything of the history of the English people can believe that there was anything like the distinction, in bed and in board, between the Saxon Thane and the Saxon Churl, aye or between the Saxon Thane and his British Slave, that there is at the present day between the millionaire and the peasant. But even were it so, were it true that the lower orders of civilized States are physically better off than of old, that is not enough. The question they ask you is—Are we better off in proportion to the enormous increase in the wealth and prosperity of our common country? If it be true that the whole standard, that the possibilities of comfort are raised, the supply of a lower is surely a cause for discontent. It is not absolute want only that is felt; it is relative want; and the bite of want is ever deeper when its tooth is sharpened by the sense of injustice. And can we believe that this education, which is being so widely extended amongst the masses of all civilized States, will not tend to raise their tastes and stimulate their desire for a higher condition of personal comfort and refinement? If we are not prepared to re-adjust in some fashion the distribution of wealth, the present policy of universal education does seem to me something like the scheme of a maniac. What is it but to sow broadcast amongst the people the seeds of discontent at a system which at the same time we tell them is the result of inexorable economic law? To educate the people—to widen the sphere of their knowledge—to train their intellect and cultivate their taste, and teach them to aspire to a higher moral and intellectual condition of existence, and at the same time to tell them that any corresponding amelioration of their physical condition is a thing hopelessly impossible,—that the privations of penury and the pangs of starvation are necessary ills, which defy the wisdom of the legislator to correct, or the benevolence of the philanthropist to relieve, what is this but to transform discontent into despair, and ultimately to convert the national school into a hotbed of the deadliest Nihilism?

Shall we then say that there is no hope for the future?—that our modern civilization must die, like those which have preceded it in the world's history? Shall we, like the men of old continue to eat and drink and marry and be given in marriage, while the waters of anarchy are oozing up under our feet, and the windows of heaven—the divine retribution for national wrong—are opening above our heads? or will the men of this generation, warned by the ruin of the civilizations of the past, evoke the means of salvation for that which we have inherited? I would fain fancy that over the storm clouds which blacken the horizon I see the bow of promise, the symbol of safety. I see it in the fact that the governments of civilized States are becoming more and more the reflex of the will of the people, and that not of peoples barbarous and ignorant as of old, but of peoples growing year by year in intelligence and knowledge, as they have already grown in political power; and I cannot but believe that, when they once come to perceive the true cause of the ills which press so heavily on their condition, no prescription of birth, or rank, or wealth, or power, will be able to withstand the fulfilment of their desires, and the application of the remedies which they are certain to, and have a right to demand. At the same time I cannot close my eyes to the one disheartening feature in the present age; it is that in the great republic of America, the greatest experiment the world has seen in the science of government, where political rights have been more widely extended and longer enjoyed than amongst any people on the earth, the same

evils, which are the inheritance of older States, are growing with the same vigorous vitality as that which characterises every development in that wonderful country. The dominance and monopoly of wealth, the strife between labor and capital the insane contrivance of the *strike*, the widening gulf between class and class, between rich and poor, are all, to take the evidence of their own writers, repeating themselves in the land of republican freedom, with the same ominous aspect as that which looms over the future of the most aristocratic of European States. But I cannot lose all faith in America; I cannot lose faith in a country which came triumphant out of the great war for the emancipation of the slave, and the maintenance of the Union; I cannot forget how, whilst the purblind critics of the English press were prophesying that the self interest and selfishness of the Western States would induce them to withhold their aid in that great struggle, all minor, all selfish considerations were merged in the instinct of a lofty patriotism; and from the farms and log huts of the western prairies, from a people, though keenly suffering under the pressure of a protective tariff which they hated, mothers sent forth their sons and wives their husbands to fight in the common cause, that, come what might, the great experiment of a free republic, to which they were pledged in the eyes of the civilized world, come what might, should be maintained in voilate. And I cannot but believe, that when that great people come to perceive the real cause of the growing evils and the possible destruction of the nation of which they are so justly proud, the singular energy and inventiveness, which are the peculiar characteristics of the American citizen, will not fail to discover or he slow to apply such remedies as may avert the threatened disaster.

And not less in these colonies of our own Empire, which have grown up as if by an enchanter's wand on the shores of the Pacific, not less on us, though on a smaller stage, does the duty lie, to meet with courage the demands of the future. We stand in a position peculiarly fitted for the attempt. Tradition and precedent, and old world forms and prejudices, and a superstitious reverence for private over public rights, have not yet interwoven round us their inextricable web. The memory, though yearly growing fainter, still lingers amongst us, of those early days in these settlements, when a community of toil, and an almost equality of wealth, bound us all, class and class together, in a strong community of feeling and interest. To us then more than to all others has fate allotted the task of dealing with the problems of the future. By what specific laws, it is not for me now to suggest, but by legislation, I confidently believe, it must be, which must be based on such a reconsideration of the rights of property, as shall tend to redistribute more equally amongst all the joint results of the productive powers of the earth and the creative energy of human labor. That the poor will ever wholly cease out of the land, and crime be heard of no more, we may not hope; but it may be the imperishable glory of the statesmen in these new born nations, so to modify the social and economical conditions of life, that wide spread poverty shall not be the necessary result of artificial law, and crime shall not be bred by the cravings of want, and matured by the sense of wrong.

And if after all it be that our civilization too is destined to fulfil the law of all organic life, and to sink into decay; if the mighty empires of the present must pass away like a tale that is told, we may yet cherish the faith, that from their ashes a new civilization will arise, to which that of the present may be but as the rude institutions of the savage or the tottering footsteps of the child; that man will rise ever higher and higher to those lofty regions of social, moral, and intellectual being, to which the secret and prophetic yearnings of his soul assure him that he is capable of aspiring, until at last his final destiny is lost to our present feeble sight in the light which shines around the throne of Him, whose image we are, and by whom and for whom all things are and were created,

vignette

Edwards and Green, Printers, Wellington.

Land and Labour: A Lecture Delivered Before the Trades' & Labour League in the Lyceum, Dunedin. JOHN BATHGATE, ESQ., M.H.R., IN THE CHAIR, BY W. M. Bolt. Dunedin: S. Lister, 192. Princes Street, MDCCCLXXXII.

To the Working Classes of New Zealand.

This Pamphlet deals with a question which more than any other affects the interest of labor, and therefore demands the most earnest and unbiassed consideration of every workman in the Colony.

It is published under the auspices of the OTAGO TRADES AND LABOUR COUNCIL, whose objects are:—

- —The organization of the Working Classes, so that in furtherance of their interests, they may at all times be able to secure uniformity of action.
- —To better the condition of the Working Classes; to assist each other in maintaining the eight hours' principle; and to give moral assistance in cases of dispute in all trades and other bodies of working men who may join the Council.
- —To obviate as far as possible the necessity for "strikes" by a careful and patient investigation of subjects

in dispute between employers and employes; and by undertaking in conjunction with the parties interested, the settlement by arbitration of disputes.

- —To use every legitimate means to obtain a proper representation of labour in the Legislature of the Colony. And to do all such things that are most essential to advance the social and moral welfare of those belonging to it.

The Council would respectfully remind the Working Classes, that the interests of labour are everywhere the same, and if the Political power now possessed by the Labourers of this Colony is to be used effectively for their well-being, they will require to be a compact body, having specific aims, and move at Elections with the order and solidarity of an army corps. With this object in view, the Council would urge upon the Working Classes and those interested in their welfare, the necessity of forming branches of the Trades and Labour League in the various Districts throughout the Colony, each having a representative at this Council, or otherwise associated with the Council, so as to insure uniformity of action.

It is also desirable that a Political Platform which would meet the approval of the various bodies, should be drawn up and determined upon, and that the priority of political questions should also be decided.

It will be apparent to the Working Classes, that in seeking to attain to a higher position in the social scale than they now occupy, it will be the greatest folly to look for much aid or encouragement from the Press of the Colony, seeing it is mainly controlled by other and opposing interests. Self-reliance, then, is necessary and there can be no doubt that *just principles, united action, and self-reliance*, will ultimately be victorious,

Information as to forming Branches &c., may readily be obtained by applying to Mr. J. C. Thorn, President of the Trades' and Labour Council, John Street, Caversham.

Land and Labour.

A few months ago, Mr Edward Wilson lectured in the Athenæum Hall in Dunedin, on the subject of "Labour_and_how Represented." At the present time no question of greater importance can occupy the attention of the labouring classes. Recent legislation has shortened the duration of Parliaments, lowered the franchise, and thereby lodged in the hands of working men a power, which if wisely exercised, will determine in no small degree our rate of progress, our national wealth, and our domestic happiness in the immediate future. That this should be so, it is necessary, however, that the popular desire expressed at the ballot-boxes should have clear and definite aims, and that those aims should be faithfully represented in the Parliament of the Colony.

The representation of labour is then a matter of vast importance, and in considering it as such we are led to ask the question, how has labour been represented in the past? By LABOUR, I mean not the aggregate of the labouring power of the country, but rather that large section of the community who receive from employers as an equivalent for their services what is popularly understood as the "current rate of wages." I am aware this is indefinite—I am aware that many of the employers themselves barely receive the "current rate of wages," and that many of the wage-earning class are in receipt of a remuneration far in excess of the general average. This arises from the complex character of our social arrangements, and is so far exceptional as not to obscure the general idea as to what is meant by "wages" and the "wage earning class." This definition being accepted, it will at once be seen that there is another class to be represented, namely, the "capitalist class." The one is the seller of labour, and the other is the buyer of labour and in this as in every other mercantile transaction the interests of the buyer and the interests of the seller are diametrically opposed.

There has been an effort made to show that those interests are identical, that what injures the one class will ultimately injure the other, and what is good for one class will redound to the general happiness. This is no doubt true. Evil is both evanescent and retributive, and good is the vital force in the social organism. This is a sort of broad generalization based on the observed tendency of things towards what Spencer calls equilibrium. But is this grand principle before the eyes of every capitalist, when he buys the labour of his fellow-man? Does his mind revert to the great social advantages which accrue from a just distribution of wealth, when engaging his servant? Is he solicitous that the remuneration he gives shall be such as will tend to develop a manly independence, and that the intellectual and moral faculties shall not be stunted in their growth by the chilling hand of poverty? Does he follow out the maxim of his professed master and do as he would be done by, when he fixes the rate of wages? Is it not rather his immediate interest to get the article he wants as cheaply as possible, wholly regardless of the wretchedness he entails on the labourer or his family? And is it not notorious that a man's business capacity is measured by his success in buying cheap and selling dear? that is *he uses a false balance at both ends of the transaction*,

The plain truth of the matter is that the stored-up energies, mental and physical of our working men are according to our present system, bought and sold on the huxtering principle we employ when we purchase a

yard of calico or a bag of potatoes: the only difference in the transaction lies in this, that the labourer's necessities are imperative and immediate. He is *forced to sell his powers at whatever sacrifice*. This is where the evil lies. The Vendee and Vendor do not occupy *the* same plane. The one makes his own terms, and *can afford to wait* until they are accepted; the other cannot afford to wait, he must live and those depending upon him: he *must accept*. And this is the position of the great majority of the people.

We now come back to the question, how have these been represented in the past, and what particular interest have they in representation. In considering these questions we trust the working men will not be led astray by identity of interests. What is wanted just now is a more equitable division of products. The labourer should not be kept in the position that he is forced to sell out his whole stock-in-trade—his labouring powers—at a ruinous sacrifice; and it is the height of folly to suppose that the party who has such a power over him, will legislate on his behalf. If working men want to be represented, they must be represented by working men, or by men whose speech and action in the past, leaves no shadow of doubt as to their line of policy. Has this been the case in the past? We trow not. Various interests have been represented in the past. The Commercial interest, the Agricultural interest, the Pastoral interest, and the Shipping interest; but has the Labouring interest been represented? A broad principle is supposed to underlie true representation, namely, that it should be based on population and not on wealth, and every liberal will affirm this to be a true principle. But what does this principle avail to the labourers of a country so long as circumstances bind them to the chariot wheels of Capital, and marshals them to the polling booths in its interest. So long as they have to look up to the "big man of the district," who will have sufficient influence to get them a Railway, a Bridge, or a Road so that they may have work.' and he increased wealth, increased value to his property, and therefore increased power over the very men who gave him his seat in Parliament. This indicates the vicious circle of political action at the present time, and one is inclined to ask, who has been benefited by this expenditure of public money? It is easy to estimate the advantages derived by the working man be he Navvy, Agricultural Labourer, Mechanic, or Merchant's Shopman. He has simply been allowed to live, and the remuneration he has received has not been determined on any principle of general utility, nor measured by the productiveness of the work he has been engaged on. Indeed it has been subject in a great measure to the will or caprice of the Contractor, the Landowner, or the Merchant who employed him. Each of those however has been benefited by the public work over and above living, and next year will probably seize a few thousand acres of the public estate, and push the Labourers further back into the ranks of servitude. I will here state what will be made clearer towards the close of this paper, that I have no quarrel with the Capitalist whose wealth is legitimately employed in the production of more wealth; that is in fashioning the natural products of the earth to the use of man. On the contrary. I propose to show that such a man no less than the Labourer, is robbed of what fairly belongs to him. But this in no way affects the truth now insisted on, that the Labourer from his necessitous circumstances is not only robbed, but frequently humiliated and degraded.

It is beside the question to point to a few of the more saving and industrious of the workers, who have been enabled after years of toil, and penury, to purchase a small piece of land and thereby secure their independence. This in the past has been very difficult of attainment, has been achieved by comparatively few of the people, and as population increases, the soil is increased in value by the labourers and thereby rendered more and more unattainable by them. For every yard of railway, for every mile of metalled roadway, for every bridge, and every house, and every hedge, which the toiling labourers rear on the soil, they rear at the same time a barrier to their own progress; because they are enriching the soil with a value far in excess of the paltry recompense they receive for their labour. The man's whole energies are taxed to make both ends meet, and while he is engaged in this sometimes hopeless task, the powerful grip of wealth is tightening on the ground whereon he stands. He is giving it a value for which his wages are no equivalent. With every succeeding day his labour has increased its price, and therefore raised it beyond his means; and when he is voting for the "big man of the district," who will get him some work during the winter, he is at the same time Inscribing a deed of enslavement for himself and family.

It is hardly necessary to enter into an elaborate argument to prove this, because it is self-evident that if a man can only subsist by applying his energies to the soil, and if that soil belongs to another, he lives at the mercy of that other—he is a serf, be he Englishman or Russian, and the rule which determines the reward for his services, is the rule that is applied to all slave labour, namely, the avarice and self interest of the Landowner.

But it may be said, this only applies to agricultural labourers or tenants. A civilized people does not live by bread alone. We are a commercial and manufacturing community. We have abundant natural products in this Colony, that will give employment to skilled labour for centuries to come. We have got to plant the germs of National life in all its varied forms. The comforts, conveniencies, and luxuries of civilization have to be extracted from our hills and valleys. Machinery and the power to use it must be brought to bear on our hidden treasures and fashion them into useful forms. We have got to build cities, to construct harbours and launch fleets on the seas. Population must be poured into the Colony—The hills must be levelled, and the rough places

made plain before the advancing iron horse, whose hot breath must be felt in every corner of the country. New forms of industry will arise as population increase and the energies of the artisan the mechanic, and the labourer in every branch of industry, will demand a price that will yield comfort and independence to all. What is wanted is capital and population to develop the natural resources of the country.

This is the alluring picture, the deceitful mirage that is ever held up before the eyes of the working man. It represents a promised land that he never sets his foot in. In no country in the world, and at no period, can it be said that wages have advanced with the increase of capital and population. On the contrary, wages have ever tended to decline as wealth and population increased, and at the present time, the most wealthy and the most thickly populated countries of Europe are the countries where wages tend to a minimum. The progress of colonization illustrates the same truth. During the earlier period of settlement, wages are at the highest, but as wealth and population increase, the reward of labour declines. And this is not caused by the population increasing in greater ratio than the wealth. In nearly all cases the aggregate wealth would give a greater proportion to the individual than before. The cause of this anomaly is the most important problem which Society has got to solve, because it is the cause of ignorance, poverty and crime. To the labourer, the mechanic, the tradesman and the small farmer, it is of pressing importance. If the root of the social organism is diseased, the lower branches will soon be infected. The labourers of a country cannot sink into poverty without dragging the middle class down to a lower level. The struggle going on in Ireland confirms this, and should be an instructive warning to the people of this Colony. We are building up new institutions in a new country, and it is for us to see that we have full freedom, and that no one, or no class, be handicapped in the race for wealth. If we do that, we will find that this question demands our first consideration, namely, how it is that wages diminish in a growing community where the aggregate wealth advances faster than the population.

Political economists surveying thickly populated countries where industrial activity is most intense; where poverty reaches its lowest, and riches its highest point, have formulated two laws to account for the diminishing rate of wages. The first of these is, that wages are paid out of capital, and that therefore the rate of wages is determined by the number amongst whom the capital is divided. The second law is the complement to the first; It is that population tends to increase faster than the means of subsistence: in other words, the pressure of numbers on the wages-fund of a country is such as to keep wages down to the lowest point at which labourers can subsist.

It is unnecessary to allude to the almost universal acceptance of these doctrines by the most eminent minds of our age. Translated in terms of biological science, the principle is known as the survival of the fittest. It implies an enormous waste of human life, and was considered to be a complete explanation of the cause of poverty. It would appear however that a more careful analysis, and a fuller experience will considerably modify this doctrine. In a new work on political economy which I have had the good fortune to read, and which has been of considerable advantage to me in preparing this paper, these two laws are assailed with great vigour of language and wealth of illustration. I allude to a work entitled "Progress and Poverty." an enquiry into the cause of Industrial Depressions, and of the cause of increased Want with increased Wealth. The author is Mr. Henry-George, once an American working man, now Professor of Political Economy in the University of San Francisco, and a perusal of it will convince the reader that Mr. George is not only learned, but is an intellectual athlete of the first order.

I cannot pretend to summarise the arguments used, but I may state shortly that Mr. George combats the doctrine that wages are paid out of capital. He affirms that labour expended upon a natural agent renders that agent a marketable commodity, and in all cases the value is attached to the agent before the labour is paid for.

Suppose a man has £5000 and he wishes to build a ship. He employs a dozen carpenters who make the keel in a week, and at the week's end he pays them their wages. His capital is now £5000 in cash less the amount paid for wages, but he has got the keel of a ship which is a marketable commodity of greater value than the wages paid out, consequently his capital has not been diminished by the payment of wages, it has been increased, and so in all cases. Labour is not limited by the wages fund of a country, it makes that fund, and every day's work of the labourer has added new wealth to what already existed. Labourers are not rubbish in the path of progress. They are not the devourers of capital, they are the producers of capital, and the more labourers the more wealth.

The existence of man during geologic periods, shows, he contends, that if the law of population is operative, its progress must be very slow and an analogy drawn from nature will also show, that the lower the scale of being the greater the prolificness. The higher in the scale of being, the less fertile; in other words "the Law of Population is subordinate to the Law of Intellectual Development.

Failing then to find the cause of poverty in those two laws, he turns to examine the laws which govern the distribution of wealth, in order to find an answer to the problem.

Here I leave the debateable land, and enter on the solid ground on which all political economists take their stand, and the question now is, when wealth is produced, on what principle is it divided, and among whom is it

divided?

There are three factors in the production of wealth, namely, the natural agent, the labour used, and the capital employed. The amount paid for the use of the natural agent is called rent. What goes for labour is termed wages, and what goes for capital is called interest. It is a question however, whether capital is a necessary element in production. I am aware it is a useful element, and will in a great measure determine the amount of production, but the *earliest settlers* on the globe started with their bare arms only and the soil on which to operate.

It is evident then that land, the natural agent, must be the prime factor in production and rent is the "price of a monopoly paid to an individual for the use of a natural agent, which he can neither produce nor increase." Land then being the prime factor, what determines the amount of the produce which goes for rent? What is the law of rent, and what causes it.

Rent according to "Ricardo" is "that portion of the produce of the earth which is paid to the landlord for the use of the original and indestructible powers of the soil." and is regulated by the *difference in the productiveness* of the land in use.—I will illustrate.

Here are three tracts of country indicating a decreasing fertility.

No. 1. is the most fertile and we shall suppose that it is all sold and still land is required. In such a case what will be the rent asked for No. 1? The rent will be all the difference in the production between No. 1. and the best land for which no rent is paid; that is No. 2. in the diagram, or in other words the rent will be 20 bushels, or the value of 20 bushels.

But as population increases it will be found necessary to occupy No. 2. in the same way, and the "margin of cultivation" is accordingly pushed back to the poor land that is marked No. 3. Rent now commences on No. 2, and is determined by the difference in the production between it and No. 3, namely, 20 bushels, while the rent of No. 1. rises to 40 bushels.

It will thus be seen that as population advances on the less fertile soils, the reward of labour diminishes while rent increases. For the sake of clearness I will again state it thus:—

Here is a tract of country resting on the margin of a navigable river having a splendid harbour, majestic forests and fertile valleys. Beneath the surface nature has stored up in abundance the heavier elements of productive power. Coal, iron, copper and other minerals. Some 4 miles distant from the shore the hills stand close together and bear on their shoulders a beautiful lake, and the rays of the sun supplies it yearly with the power of millions of men. And all this tract of country with all its natural capabilities, is owned by one or a few men, As you proceed into the interior, and after passing the limits of ownership nature gets less generous the natural advantages get less and less, and at last you meet with absolute sterility. A few settlers begin to arrive, and the first has the choice whether to pay to the owner a certain sum for these natural advantages, or settle on the less productive land which lies beyond the line of ownership. If he accepts the former, he pays to the owner an amount equal to the difference of production between the productive and the less productive land. For the time being, and in order to adopt the language of political economists, I will call this less productive land the "margin of cultivation." It is the best land that is open to the labourer, without the payment of rent. It may be said that there is no inducement to settle on the more productive land if the whole difference of produce is given in rent. But there is. Man is a social animal; he enjoys many comforts, many conveniences, and the immense advantages of social intercourse for which his mind is continually craving, by living alongside of his fellow man. The next settler acts upon the same principle, and the next, and the next. Other things being equal, the social instinct keeps them together; population gradually increases; the first few huts give place to a village; trade and commerce take root in the soil, and the natural storerooms which lay hidden beneath the hills are broken into, and their untold wealth brought to light.

Our original proprietor we may suppose during these few years may have done nothing but smoked his pipe in a mud hut, or boozed in the village inn. The produce from his land is now enormously increased. What is the price he now asks? He just asks the same terms, the difference between the advantages his land offers, and that which can be obtained from the land for which no rent is paid. Still population increases; natural advantages combine with social enjoyment. The village gives place to the town, warehouses are built, docks are constructed and vessels are launched into them; manufactories are started, iron arms nerved by the power of steam, work ceaselessly in the mines, and throw the treasures to the surface; a productive power is drawn from the lake on the hills, and the electric current links the city with other portions of the world.

Land is now sold, or rather the monopoly is sold by inches. To line the surface with sovereigns would not purchase it, and still our original proprietor is smoking his pipe, and enjoying his glass of beer, and still his terms are the same, namely, "All that part of the production which his land will give, over what the same application will get from the least productive land in use."

But population still keeps growing. It has now leaped the boundaries of the estate and occupied the less productive land. The vicious principle of private ownership has been extended to this land also. In the language

of political economy the "margin of cultivation is lowered, "and now lies at very poor land.

What are our landlords terms now? It is the same principle but the terms are different. He now claims all the produce which his land gives above what can be had by similar application from the poor land, (No 3 in the diagram) that now forms the margin of cultivation. What is the result? Wages immediately fall, because *wages are measured by the returns from the poorest land in use, that is the best land that can be had without the payment of rent*. And the fall is felt through all the avenues of industry, because industry has been touched at the base of operations and the ill-requited labourers whose supplies have been curtailed, rush into other departments of labour, and in a short time the wages in those departments reach the level indicated by the now lowered margin of cultivation.

Our landlord has never yet taken that pipe out of his mouth, nevertheless he is now in possession of all the luxuries of civilization. He is now the "big man of the district." He has a "stake in the country," and is bound to be solicitous for its advancement. He owns vast tracks of land in various parts of the country. He controls the Legislature, and taxes property of ALL sorts to put a railway through his land. The working man—whom Tory Journals pat on the back and call the "practical man," not given to theorize—throws his hat in the air and shouts with delight when he is returned at the top of the poll, Young men keep silence in his presence, and old men stand up when he passes by. He has a castle in the country, and a marble mansion in town, but as Mr. George remarks, "there is an alms-house behind it," and there are men faint for want of work, and little children are crying in the street for want of bread.

The Law of Rent then is something for every man and woman to remember. It is the leading question in the political catechism, and has been stated thus. "*The rent of land is determined by the excess of the produce over that which the same application can secure from the least productive land in use.*"

It will be apparent that immediately this law is apprehended, the laws that govern wages and interest come into view. "If Tom, Dick, and Harry get an orange and Tom gets for his share ALL the juicy portion, it is easily seen what Dick and Harry gets. It will be noted that whenever wages are low, interest, the reward of capital is also low, and rent is high."

The law which regulates the reward of labour, the second factor in production, is the next question to be remembered. It has been stated thus. "*Wages depend upon the margin of production, or upon the produce which labour can obtain at the highest point of natural productiveness open to it without the payment of rent.*"

When these laws are fairly recognised, the cause of poverty will be apparent, because it will be seen that the rate of wages is determined by what labour can produce at the margin of cultivation where land is of little or no value; and as population increases, and as new inventions are introduced into a country, this point descends to still less productive soils, and wages accordingly fall while rent proportionally rises.

Nor is this disproportion between the reward of labour and the claims of the land owner lessened by scientific discovery, or the use of labour-saving machinery. These but increase the evil, because greater production implies a greater demand and with every new discovery the margin of cultivation is liable to be lowered to a point of still greater sterility. Wages it is true may in some cases not fall, because the efficiency of the machine may compensate for the greater inferiority of the soil, but the whole increase of the production from land previously occupied will go to rent—the labourer will not be benefited—the inequality will be greater than before.

This explains how it is that rent tends to rise as wages tend to fall. It is unnecessary to fall back on the Malthusian law to account for poverty; that doctrine may or may not be true. If true, that truth will be made clearer by restatement and fuller exposition; if false, the sooner it dies the better. Of this I am certain, that in our system of distribution we have the efficient cause of poverty, and that with such a system neither prudential nor positive checks on the population would be of much avail. When Malthus propounded the law known by his name, the population was then pressing against the means of subsistence. Since then the productive power of machinery has increased a thousand fold, while population has not trebled, and still population is pressing against the means of subsistence and if the population was lowered to-morrow, the discoveries of science, new inventions and improved modes of production, would still cause a demand for land. The margin of cultivation would still be liable to be lowered, and wages would be measured by the returns from that lowered margin.

Let us presume the population to be stationary within certain limits, and that wages are fixed at what is known as the standard of comfort. Suppose a new invention is introduced that does the work of one sixth of the population, one of two things will take place: either one sixth of the population will be thrown out of employment and the production remain as before, or the production will be increased with the usual result. The labourer is not in a position to get his share in the increased production. Some at least are thrown out of work, the margin of cultivation would be lowered, rent would go up and wages remain as before, "because the new invention would take so much more out of the extended margin. The whole benefit would go to rent—the inequality must still exist."

Suppose the productive power of a country was doubled to-morrow, and this amounts to the same thing as

if the population was lowered one half, the result would be the same, This illustration I shall give in Mr. George's own words. He says:—" In the very centres of our civilization to-day are want and suffering enough to make sick at heart whoever does not close his eyes and steel his nerves, Dare we turn to the Creator and ask him to relieve it. Suppose the prayer were heard and at the behest with which the universe sprang into being, there should glow in the sun a greater power, new virtue fill the air, fresh vigour the soil; that for every blade of grass that now grows two should spring up, and the seed that now increases fifty-fold should increase a hundred-fold! Would poverty be abated or want relieved? Manifestly no! whatever benefit would accrue would be but temporary. The new powers streaming through the Material Universe could only be utilized through land, and land being private property the class that now monopolize the bounty of the Creator, would monopolize all the new bounty. Land owners would alone be benefited; rents would increase, but wages would still tend to the starvation point."

It is not difficult to characterize a system such as this. Life is short and I for one have not time to search the vocabulary for polished modes of expression—I shall call it "robbery." We know that wealth is the reward of labour and labour-only, and the man that appropriates the results of another's labour is not an honest man, and the system that allows him to do so however venerable it may be, or however "practical" as Tory newspapers call it, it is an unjust system and must come to an end. What are our duties then in regard to this subject. Does individual conduct illustrate what our social action should be? I think it does. When an individual finds that he has been systematically robbed he does two things; first he takes means to prevent a repetition of the theft, and second, he endeavours to recover as much of the stolen property as possible.

If the property exists, and if it is within reach, justice no less than self-interest demands restitution, and every HONEST man would render what assistance he could in bringing the culprit to book. But what would he think if he found a man ever endeavouring to dissuade him from such a course, one who was continually speaking of the difficulties of seizure, pointing out that a great part of his property was already gone; that it was now too late to secure the remainder against further depredation; that it would be very impolitic to do so because the pilferer was rich and he might assist him in some other way; that it was all very well [*unclear: au-*] theory to lock his doors, but that under the present circumstances it was wholly "impracticable," and that the best thing he could do would be to give every facility for further robbery, and endeavour to get rid of his property as soon as possible—Would he not have very good reasons for suspecting such a man to be interested in the swindle? Would he not conclude that the man's moral sense was blunted, that he was not a man to be trusted, and that it would be wise in the future to avoid his company and despise his advice. Well, this is the language of our local press and indeed of the press in general when speaking of the nationalization of land. They do not attempt to say the principle is wrong; they cannot say that, but they say it is a Utopian idea—a wild theory—a visionary scheme, and laugh complacently into the face of the landless man, expressing assurance that he has too good sense to harbour such impracticable notions, and picture what a miserable wretch he would be without the hope of a bit of land. It is to be hoped that the "landless man" will soon have too good sense to be laughed out of his birthright in this way.

To say that a thing is impracticable and beset with difficulties is a poor argument against the demands of justice. Tory notions of what is practicable will not weigh much against human rights, and the right of every man and woman to the use of the soil can never be abrogated, because it is inscribed on the same charter which gives them the right to exist. If then men are desirous to be relieved from want; if they wish to cultivate their higher faculties; if they wish to stand upright on the broad sides of the world and feel that dignity which only independence can give, they will throw their block vote at elections against the barbarous custom of selling for a few pieces of metal, a perpetual monopoly in the natural elements of wealth, and if a man or a newspaper declare their action to be *impolitic* or *impracticable* and begin to raise up difficulties, such an one must be told to step back from the ranks of honest men, and take his place as an aider and a abettor of a monstrous wrong. No SELLING OF LAND. No MONOPOLY IN THE NATURAL ELEMENTS OF WEALTH is the first principle to be fought for in the Re-presentation of Labour.

The next question is, how are we to deal with those who already hold a monopoly in natural agents? How is Society to enter into possession of the wealth which arises neither from the labour nor capital of the owner, but indirectly from the labour and capital expended by Society?

First we notice that this monopoly was never sold by the people. In all countries this wrong was committed by a section of the people for a section of the people. A title to exclusive property in land is not based on a natural right, but on an act of parliament, and an act of parliament can render it void. It is unnecessary to go to extreme measures however, even if we had the power. All that is required is to send round the Tax Collector. The taxation of land values—the confiscation of the whole of the increment of rent which population gives to land is the next point to be insisted on in the Representation of Labour.

The third object to be aimed at is the imposition of a progressive tax on all large estates—a tax increasing in power in proportion to the size of the estate—a tax that will not only make it unprofitable, but will make it a

positive loss for a man to hold exclusive ownership in a large section of land. And the fourth point to be insisted on, is the setting apart a portion of the revenue arising from the taxation of land for the purpose of re-purchasing what has already been sold.'

These are the four main principles involved in the Representation of Labour. They not only interest *labour* properly so called, they interest the whole of the trading community as well, because their prosperity is increased by the producing and consuming power of the classes immediately below them.

It is useless to ask the "big man of the district" to represent these principles. It does not take an eloquent or a deeply learned man to advocate them in the parliament of the colony; because it is hopeless to convert landholders and land speculators by argument. All that is wanted is an honest man having an average share of common sense, and a determination to do what he can to carry out the principles at stake.

To say that this is a wild and visionary scheme notwithstanding the immense areas of land still held by the crown in this colony, is to draw a political herring of the rankest odour across the nose of labour. If it is a visionary scheme here, what must it be in old countries like England, where poverty and revolution are forcing the problem before the eyes of statesmen.

What does Mr. Gladstone say? Does he call it a visionary scheme? In his speech at West Calder, Midlothian, Nov, 27, 1879, he said:—" Now Gentleman to a proposal of that kind I am not going to object upon the ground that it would be inconsistent with the privileges of landed proprietors. In my opinion if it is known to be for the welfare of the community at large, the Legislature is perfectly entitled to buy out the landed proprietors. * * * I freely own that compulsory expropriation is a thing which for an adequate public object is in itself admissible and so far sound in principle."

It will be noted that the policy here advocated is in some respects similar to the land policy of Sir George Grey's Government, and one of the leading features of the Local Government Bill introduced by Sir George last year, was the setting apart of certain lands for communal purposes. It is a policy which gets the sanction of every eminent mind at the present day. It is the policy which the democratic spirit of the age is demanding in the name of justice in every corner of Europe. A new civilization born of liberty and independence follows in its train, and already on the political horizon may be seen the dawning glory of the coming splendour.

Are the people of this Colony who consider themselves the friends of progress to help perpetuate this monstrous wrong? Are we going to continue a system that not only robs the living but robs generations yet unborn? Are we going to place our children in the mire of poverty, and prepare a struggle for them in the future similar to that now engaged in by the people of Ireland? Are we to give them a liberal education and prepare them for the enjoyment of freedom, and then sell their right to the use of the earth to a few individuals? Have we felt the burden of life so little that we are willing to transmit an additional load to them? And can we expect that they will reach that moral and intellectual status which we profess so much to admire, when they are engaged in an arena like combatants of old in a life and death struggle against fearful odds? The path of progress is not so difficult to find as some suppose, it runs parallel with justice; and if we are to advance, and if our institutions are to have stability, we must advance on the lines of justice to all. Justice only can give permanence to our institutions, and justice requires that the natural elements of the globe shall be free to all,

The advantages accruing from State ownership of land are so enormous, that it is difficult to realise them. It is different from the ownership of Railways, Telegraph lines, or of property of any kind which is the product of labour; because such property is subject to deterioration, and consequently is ever requiring renewal. Land on the other hand is ever increasing in value. In old countries as in new, with every succeeding generation of men it is increasing at an enormous rate.

During the last 30 years the value of a building section in London rose in price from £40,000 to £83,000. The landlord who lived at the West End had only to recline in his easy-chair and complacently watch the process. Suburban property until recently has also rapidly advanced in price, and in the Colonies it increases sometimes twenty-fold in a few years.

In 1836 the land rents of England amounted to about £45,000,000, recently they had risen to £67,000,000; and what has caused the increase? Has the land-owners done anything to increase the value of the soil? They have done nothing; and yet they demand that an additional £22,000,000 shall annually be paid to them by the toilers of England, and this unrighteous demand has been so long complied with, that it is now popularly considered to be just.

The people of New Zealand will do well to mark the importance of these figures; because if we advance socially on our present lines, they point to the doom that awaits our posterity—a doom that is inevitable even if every man in the colony had now a farm of his own. If such were the case, it would be found here as in England, that the power of capital would soon diminish the number of farms, and increase the size of the estates; and at no distant date the evils of landlordism would again confront a poverty-stricken people.

There is no escape from these evils but by making the state the landlord. Let "the Government act on behalf of the people, as trustees now act in the matter of private estates, and the whole of the increment of wealth

which population gives to land would be thrown into the coffers of the state, and come back to the people in a perennial and ever increasing stream.

The impetus which would thus be given to every industrial process would be immense. Taxation in all its present forms could be dispensed with. The customs department might be abolished. Free trade would become a reality and not merely a name, and our open harbours welcome to our shores every product which nature had denied us.

Natural elements being free and wealth abundant and equitably apportioned, there would be no need of a protective tariff. The labourer would not clamour for a custom-house to block the path of commerce, because the increasing wealth in the hands of the State would offer ready employment and bounteous reward, and every foreign addition to his store would be welcomed as a luxury which his prosperous condition had brought to his table.

All civilizations in the past have been fostered wherever nature has been most prolific—where natural conditions enabled man to supply his wants with little effort and gave him leisure for reflection. The valley of the Ganges and the valley of the Nile are the most remarkable in this respect. Modern forms of productive power, such as steam and electricity, are natural forces operating in a similar direction. It is nature assisting the man, relieving him from the most exhausting forms of toil, and at the same time developing his intellectual faculties. In social conditions such as I have alluded to, what might we not expect from the intellectual activity which would accompany the general prosperity, New discoveries and new inventions in labour-saving machinery would be more than ever brought into the service of man. The lamp of science would pierce still further into the mysteries of nature, and her forces would minister to his wants, and lay her treasures at his feet in richer abundance, To a thoughtful man nothing gives larger promise for the future than a knowledge of the enormous forces of nature that play around him wild and untamed. They are his future slaves, and a rapid advance of intellectual power would hasten their conquest and lay them subject at his feet. Even the hurricane might be found to be a friend in disguise as the lightning has already been.

Nor would the moral effects be less. The creation of libraries, the erection of Schools, and the well paid and efficient schoolmaster, would all tend to elevate purify and enoble the mind. Ignorance is truly said to be the mother of crime, but not more so than poverty, and especially poverty in the midst of riches. Inequality in position invariably gives rise to a sense of injustice. We are here for a short time only; we have a lease of the world for the few years we occupy it. Why then should the terms of lease be so different? Why should the struggle for existence be of such a terrible nature with the mass of mankind, as to call forth the worst passions of their nature; greed, envy, cunning, sharpness—business habits as it is so called—which frequently means untruthfulness, dishonesty, and often murder? In the midst of increasing wealth why should we smother the charitable promptings of the heart? In the midst of general abundance why should a man be induced by the pleading of his stomach or the destitution of his children to defraud his employer or steal from his neighbour, and this while the trouble of others consist in not knowing how to increase the rounds of their pleasure Inequality is the curse of the present age not only for the poor but also for the rich, and is thoroughly opposed to the christian spirit. M. Emile de Laveleye says "Christianity is a religion of equality; the gospel is the good news brought to the poor, and Christ is no friend to the rich. His immediate disciples and the religious orders that have attempted to follow strictly his teachings have lived on terms of equality. If Christianity were taught and understood in consonance with the spirit of its founder, the present social organisation would not last a day." And Emanuel Fichte says, "Christianity carries still in itself an undisputed power of renovation, until now it has only acted on individuals and indirectly by them on the State. But he who has recognised all the power of the doctrine of Christ either as a thinker or as a believer, will not doubt that one day it must become the internal organizing strength of the state, and then only shall it appear in all the depth of its principle and all the richness of its blessing."

There can be no morality without freedom. Liberty lies at the root of every conception of right conduct, and there can be no true liberty until the elements of nature are free to all. On this point Mr. Herbert Spencer remarks:—"Briefly reviewing the argument, we see that the right of each man to the use of the earth limited only by the like rights of his fellow men is immediately deducible from the law of equal freedom. We see that the maintenance of this right, necessarily forbids private property in land. We find lastly that the theory of the heir-ship of all men to the soil, is consistent with the highest civilization, and that however difficult it may be to embody that theory in fact, equity sternly commands it to be done;" and Mr. George says:—

"It is something grander than benevolence, something more august than charity—it is justice herself that demands of us to right this wrong—justice that will not be put off—justice that with the scales carries the sword. Shall we ward the stroke with liturgies and prayers; shall we avert the decrees of immutable law by raising churches, when hungry infants moan, and weary mothers weep?

Though it may take the language of prayer, it is blasphemy that attributes to the inscrutable decrees of Providence the suffering and brutishness that come of poverty; that turns with folded hands to the All-Father,

and lays on him the responsibility for the want and crime of our great cities. We degrade the Everlasting; we slander the Just One. A merciful man would have better ordered the world. A just man would crush with his foot such an ulcerous anthill. It is not the Almighty, but we who are responsible for the vice and misery that fester amid our civilization. The Creator showers upon us his gifts—more than enough for all, but like swine scrambling for food we tread them in the mire—tread them in the mire while we tear and rend each other.

This is not merely a deduction of political economy, it is a fact of experience. We know it because we have seen it. Within our own time, under our very eyes, that Power which is above all, and in all, and through all; that Power of which the whole Universe is but the manifestation; that Power which make the all things and without which is not anything made that is made, has increased the bounty which men may enjoy as truly as though the fertility of nature had been increased.

Into the mind of one came the thought that harnessed steam for the services of mankind. To the inner ear of another was whispered the secret that compels the lightning to bear a message round the globe. In every direction have the laws of matter been revealed; in every department of industry have arisen arms of iron and fingers of steel, whose effects upon the production of wealth have been precisely the same as an increase in the fertility of nature. What has been the result? Simply that land owners get all the gain. The wonderful discoveries and inventions of our century have neither increased wages nor lightened toil. The effect has simply been to make the few rich, the many more helpless. * * * Can this state of things continue? Turn to history and on every page may be read the lesson that such wrong never goes unpunished. Nay the pillars of the State are trembling even now, and the very foundations of society begin to quiver with pent-up forces that glow underneath. * * * The fiat has gone forth, with steam and electricity and the new powers born of progress, forces have entered the world, that will either compel us to a higher plane, or overwhelm us as civilization after civilization have been overwhelmed before. * * * Between democratic ideas and the aristocratic adjustments of society there is an irreconcilable conflict. Here in the United States as there in Europe, it may be seen arising. We cannot go on permitting men to vote, and forcing them to tramp. We cannot go on educating boys and girls in our public schools, and then refuse them the right to earn an honest living. We cannot go on prating of the inalienable rights of men, and then denying their inalienable rights to the bounty of the Creator. Even now in the old bottles the new wine begins to ferment, and elemental forces gather for the strife.

"Sons of Labour! keep ye moving
Onward in the march of mind;
Every step your paths improving,
Leaving olden tracks behind.

Every soul-enslaving fetter,
Burst and break and cast away,
That the world may be the better,
For your needs some other day,

Be no longer led like cattle,
Custom-bound to feudal laws;
Glorious is the mental battle,
Waged in Freedom's sacred cause."

Annual Report of the Dunedin Chamber of Commerce. August, 1882. Dunedin: Printed at the "Daily Times" Office, Dowling Street. MDCCCLXXXII.

Officers and Committee, 1882-1883.

Chairman:

- Robert Wilson.

Vice-Chairman:

- George Joachim.

Committee:

- T. Brown
- G. L. Denniston
- G. Bell
- J. M. Jones
- J. R. Danson
- A. C. Begg
- A. S. Paterson
- H. Young
- W. G. Neill
- R. Gillies

Secretary:

- H. Houghton.

List of Members.

- Ashcroft, James
- Austin, T.
- Baldwin, Capt.
- Bank of New Zealand.
- Bank of New South Wales
- Bank of Australasia
- Bartleman, A.
- Bastings, H.
- Bathgate, J.
- Beal, L. O.
- Begg, A. C.
- Bell, George
- Benjamin, H.
- Black, C.
- Blair R.
- Blakeley, John
- Blyth, George
- Brown, Thomas
- Brown, W.
- Brydone, T.
- Burt, A.
- Bury, Maxwell
- Cargill, E. B.
- Colonial Insurance Co.
- Colonial Bank of New Zealand.
- Connell, J.
- Cowie, George
- Danson, J.
- Davie, John

- Denniston, G. L.
- Driver, Henry
- Dymock, W.
- Elliott, G. W.
- Esther, George
- Ewing, R.
- Fargie, J.
- Farquhar, G. P.
- Fenwick, George
- Findlay, J.
- Fish, Jun., H. S.
- Fulton, P.
- Gilchrist, William
- Gillies, R.
- Glendining, R.
- Gregg, William
- Guthrie, H.
- Guthrie, W.
- Haggitt, B. C.
- Hannay, W. H.
- Hart, H.
- Hay, R., C. E.
- Hayman, M.
- Haynes, D.
- Heeles, M. G.
- Hepburn, W.
- Hislop, J.
- Hodgkins, W. M.
- Hogg, James
- Holmes, A.
- Hosking, J. H.
- Houghton, J.
- Howison, C. M.
- Irvine, W.
- Jack, A. H.
- Joachim, G.
- Joel, M.
- Jones, J. M.
- Kempthorne, T.W.
- Kenyon, E. P.
- Kirkpatrick, H.
- Kohn, S.
- Larnach, W. J. M., C.M.G
- Law, H.
- Leary, R. H.
- Lees, A.
- Lees, W.
- Lewis, G.
- Logan, P.
- Maclean, G.
- Maclean, H. J.
- Marine Insurance Co.
- Marshall, J.
- Matheson, G. C.
- Meenan, F.
- Mendershausen, M.
- Mills, James
- Mill, John

- Moore, C,
- Mollison, A.
- Morrison, J. H.
- Mudie, J.B.
- McFarlane, A.
- McKerras, J. T.
- McLaren, R.
- McNeill, H.
- McQueen, C.
- National Bank of New Zealand.
- National Insurance Co. of New Zealand.
- Neill, P. C.
- Neill, W. G.
- New Zealand Insurance Co.
- New Zealand Shipping Co.
- Nimmo, R.
- Oliver, R.
- Paterson, A. S.
- Paterson, R.
- Petre, F. W.
- Proctor, F.
- Proudfoot, D.
- Pym, M.
- Pyke, V.
- Quick, E.
- Ramsay, K.
- Reid, D.
- Reynolds, W. H.
- Richards, John
- Ritchie, T. T.
- Ritchie, J. M.
- Roberts, W. C.
- Roberts, J.
- Robin, J.
- Ross, A. H.
- Ross, M.
- Royse, William
- Russell, Gray
- Saunders, R.
- Scott, Capt, R. N.
- Scott, J. R.
- Scoular, W.
- Scoullar, A.
- Shand, J.
- Sievwright, B.
- Simpson, W. L.
- Sinclair, J.
- Singer, B.
- Sise, G. L.
- Smith, J.
- South British Insurance Co.
- Spedding, D. M.
- Spence, E. J.
- Sprent, J. S.
- Standard Insurance Co.
- Stewart, J.
- Stewart, W. D.
- Stephenson, —

- Stout, Robert
- Stronach, D.
- Thomson, A.
- Turnbull, G.
- Union Insurance Co.
- Union Bank of Australia.
- Victoria Insurance Co.
- Walden, Henry
- Wales, N. Y.
- Watson, G.
- Watson, W.
- White, J.
- Wilkie, James
- Wilkinson, T. M.
- Wilson, James.
- Wilson, James
- Wilson, R.
- Wright, J. T.
- Wright, Wm.
- Young, T.
- Young, H.

Dunedin Chamber of Commerce.

Report of the Committee of the Dusedin Chamber of Commerce for the year ending 30th June, 1882, presented at the Annual Meeting held on the 12th September, 1882,—the President, Mr. W. J. M. Larnach, in the chair.

Report of Committee.

The Committee beg to submit their report for the past year, which embraces the principal subjects considered by the Chamber during that period ending 30th June, 1882. The subjects which have chiefly engaged their attention are as follows:—

Direct Steam communication with Great Britain; Otago Central Railway; Otago Dock Trust; Dunedin Railway Station; The earlier delivery of Northern Mails; Delays in delivery of Cargo from ships discharging in Port Chalmers; Harbour Board's amended regulations and imposition of increased dues; The American Tariff on Wool; Jetty Street Crossing; Agricultural College; The New Chamber of Commerce Building; Bills of Sale and Bankruptcy Amendment Act and Conference relating thereto, held at Wellington; Associated Chamber of Commerce; Additional Wharf Accommodation; Refrigerating Meat and Dairy Produce.

The work of the Committee during the past year has, so far, not resulted in any very practical or useful legislation; but this has not arisen from any want of care or attention in the part of the Committee. During the past and present Sessions of Parliament, bills having any bearing on the commercial interests of this community have been carefully watched by the Committee, and, whenever necessary, the attention of the local members of the Assembly or of the Government have been called to the subjects, and suggestions made thereon. Several questions of more or less importance to the Commercial and Shipping interests have been brought under the consideration of the Committee; and one which has received a large amount of attention is that connected with the Harbour Board, and the legislation sought by that body.

DIRECT STEAM COMMUNICATION WITH GREAT BRITAIN,.

though not yet an accomplished fact, has made satisfactory progress during the past year. Arrangements have been made by which the first shipment of frozen meat will be despatched from Port Chalmers by a direct steamer in the course of this month.

In connection with this subject very satisfactory progress is being made in removing the Bar at the Heads, and it is expected that this hitherto obstruction to the trade of this port will shortly be overcome.

OTAGO CENTRAL RAILWAY.

This subject has again been brought forward in the Chamber, and its importance to the settlement of the

interior of this province has been urged by the Representatives of Otago in the Assembly, and there is now every reasonable hope that this important line will receive at the hands of Government the consideration it requires.

OTAGO DOCK TRUST..

The Act for the formation of an enlarged Graving Dock at Port Chalmers, and for vesting in trustees certain endowments and powers to enable this important work to be carried out, was duly passed during the last session. Some delay has arisen in giving effect to the same, owing to the Government requiring actual proof of the present dredging operations being able to effect the needed deepening of the Bar before handing the endowments over to the Trust.

DUNEDIN RAILWAY STATION.

This question which has given rise to much controversy has happily been ended, by which conflicting interests have been arranged.

HARBOUR IMPROVEMENT DUES.

This subject which has given rise to a somewhat acrimonious controversy was for a time almost daily before the Committee during the three preceding months. Several conferences, with a deputation from the Harbour Board have been held, and the result of the joint deliberations has on several occasions been submitted to members in General Meeting, with the result that a modified scale of dues has been arranged to the satisfaction of all parties.

AMERICAN WOOL DUTIES.

The efforts that have been made by the united Chambers in New Zealand, and by the Governments of New South Wales and Victoria to induce the American Government to modify their duty on wool imported into the United States have, thus far, failed to obtain a relaxation in favour of these Colonies

BANKRUPTCY LAW, BILLS OF SALE AMENDMENT ACTS, AND SUPREME COURT PROCEEDURE,

have each received much attention during the past year by the Committee. The Hon. W. H. Reynolds was appointed delegate on behalf of the Chamber to attend a Conference held at Wellington last month, and the Committee express a hope that the present Session will not close without giving effect to the recommendations of the Royal Commission on law procedure, and of the Conference of delegates of the Chambers of Commerce embodied in their respective reports.

THE NEW EXCHANGE BUILDING.

Members of the Chamber are to be congratulated on the commodious suite of offices they have now obtained for their use in which the important business of the Chamber can be carried on with satisfaction. An alteration in Rule VIII., by which the advantages of membership is offered at a reduced rate of subscription to members of a firm, should lead to a large increase of subscribers and convenience to all engaged in commerce in this city.

The following is the Statement of Receipts and Expenditure for the past year, and in retiring from office the Committee desire to reiterate the great benefits derivable from the action of an influential Chamber of Commerce watching over and in many ways influencing the commercial interests of this important part of New Zealand.

The usual Statistics, compiled chiefly from the Government returns, are appended.

Report of Sub-Committee re discharge and delivery of Cargo at Port Chalmers and Dunedin.

The Sub-Committee appointed by the Committee of the Chamber of Commerce "to obtain information and to take steps for expediting the delivery of goods from ships discharging at Port Chalmers" have now concluded their enquiry, and they beg to state that they have examined witnesses representing the Principal Importers, the

Shipping Interest, the Railway, the Lighters and the Harbour Board, they have personally inspected the wharves and sheds at the Port and at Dunedin, and after a careful consideration of the evidence brought before them they have to report as follows:—

DISCHARGE OF CARGO AT PORT CHALMERS.

An occasional scarcity of trucks and the difficulty of dealing with goods intended for transhipment, whether arranged for by through Bill of Lading or sold by Importers in Dunedin for delivery to other ports appear to be the chief causes of delay at the Port, but it must be added that a block in the sheds and wharves at Dunedin will react upon the operations at the Port and further retard the discharge of cargo there. Besides the causes above mentioned it remains to be stated that delay is sometimes incurred by cargo being kept on board to suit the wishes of importers, sometimes also the ships retain a portion of their heavy cargo for the purpose of stiffening.

DELIVERY OF GOODS AT DUNEDIN.

There is a considerable and unnecessary-delay in the delivery of cargo at this end, arising from the following causes.

- 1st. The failure of many importers to pass their entries and take away their goods within a reasonable time.
- 2nd. Want of sufficient shed accommodation at the Railway and the Harbour Wharf.
- 3rd. Occasional scarcity of carters.

The average time for delivery of Drapery and fine goods, reckoning from date of arrival of ship to date of receiving the last package into warehouse, is 21 days, while that for rough goods including pig iron and cement, is frequently protracted to from 30 to 50 days, while cases are on record where vessels have been particularly wanted for re-loading or for quick despatch to another port, in which the whole cargo has been discharged and sent up to town in from three to 11 days. Their cargoes, however, were not all taken away from the sheds for ten days or a fortnight after the last package had been sent up.

Importers who have only a few packages in any one vessel can frequently get delivery quicker by Railway than by Lighter, but for the bulk of the cargo there is little to choose between the two modes of transit.

The Committee beg to make the following recommendations:—

(a) WITH REFERENCE TO TRANSHIPMENT CARGO.

- 1st. That it should be strongly urged upon the loading firms in England to assort the goods and have all packages intended for a particular port stowed by themselves and not mixed up indiscriminately with the cargo as at present. This method would at once obviate a most vexatious delay which nearly always occurs, and would enable importers of these transhipment goods to get forward their parcels in one steamer, instead of receiving them in dribblets as they do now.
- 2nd. That the Government should provide a shed at Port Chalmers for the reception of transhipment goods where they could remain until the coasting steamers could take them on board.

The District Traffic Manager of the Railway stated to the Committee that the Government had purchased a shed at Port Chalmers and that it was available for the purpose, but, as no siding runs through it, the use of it would involve unloading and reloading goods, the expense of which would practically be prohibitive. Moreover, two of the three Shipping Companies were not aware of its existence for such a purpose. What is wanted, is a shed where Railway trucks loaded with transhipment goods could stand for a day or two until the steamer could come alongside the Pier and receive them. In addition to the transhipment cargo proper coming forward under through Bill of Lading, importers frequently sell goods from their Dunedin parcels for delivery to ports along the coast, and expect the ships to keep these goods on board free of charge until the coasting steamers can take deliver. As this entails both delay and expense to the ship, the Committee are of opinion that such goods should be subject to a charge for putting them into the transhipment shed.

(b) WITH REFERENCE TO THE DELIVERY OF GOODS AT DUNEDIN.

- 1st That a Queen's Bonded Warehouse should be established, and that all goods for which entries have not been passed and delivery taken within two days of their arrival at Dunedin, should be placed in it at the Importers' expense.

The Railway and the Harbour Board have the right to charge storage on goods not taken away within a given time, but owing to competition between the Railway and the Lighters this right has never been enforced.

- 2nd. That sufficient shed accommodation be provided at the Railway Station and the Harbour Wharf, to

allow the goods to be sorted as they come to hand—those for which entries have been passed to be put into a convenient place ready for delivery, while those which have not been entered should be put aside and not allowed to interfere with the rest of the cargo.

Some attempt has, indeed, been made by the Railway at such an assortment, but importers of fine goods who are anxious to get delivery complain that it is yet frequently impossible to get at their packages owing to cargo for which no entry has been passed being piled up in front, and causing often a delay of days, sometimes even weeks.

- 3rd. That each importer should be allowed to employ his own carter.

If these recommendations were carried out the Committee are of opinion that vessels might easily discharge their cargoes in fourteen days with their own crews, and in seven to ten days if extra gangs of men were employed.

The President delivered the following Address:—

Gentlemen,—It is my pleasure and duty to address you a second time at the close of a financial year, and in doing so I have the privilege to state at the outset of my remarks that the proceedings of our past year have not been wanting in really good and useful work done on the part of this Chamber.

In the first place, allow me to remind you that I am speaking now within the walls of a handsome building, erected and dedicated for the purpose of considering and promoting the well-being and commerce of Dunedin City and its districts. At our last annual meeting I spoke to you of the terms and conditions under which it was proposed to secure for this city a proper building in which to conduct the business appertaining to a Chamber of Commerce, and it is a satisfaction to me—and I feel sure it is also one to each of you—to meet to-day in our own Chamber in our young City, with facilities and material capable of discussing the commerce of the world.

Chief among some of our anticipations on the acquirement of new offices, that of a considerable increase in the number of our members, has been fairly realised. In the preceding year our ranks counted 147, now we can claim 174 members. While the change is in the right direction, I feel that I am not presuming to dictate to my fellow-citizens in asking all who treat with, or take an interest in Commerce, to rally round us and join our meetings. Assist us in our discussions and deliberations.

Dunedin City, to my mind, is making strides far ahead of the steps yet taken by its Chamber of Commerce, and I can only hope that the latter will keep pace with the former by a continuous flow of new members into our midst, thereby imparting new ideas, from which will spring fresh subjects for thought and argument.

The principal questions that have claimed our attention during the past year I shall divide into three classes.

Firstly, those in which no advancement has been made, viz., The Otago Dock Trust, American Tariff on Wool, Otago Agricultural College, Associated Chamber of Commerce, Delays in Delivery of Cargo from Ships in Port, and Additional Wharf Accommodation.

Each of these matters has had the attention of your Committee at various times throughout the year, and regarding the Dock Trust, nothing further can be done towards pushing on the work under it until a satisfactory result can be shown by the operations of the new dredge on the Bar at the Heads, the Government having made that a *sine quâ non* before the endowments and powers of the trust are to be allowed to take effect.

No further progress has been made with a view to the abolishment of American duties on Australasian Wools, because nothing more at present in that direction can be done by your Committee. I can only say, therefore, that the matter rests entirely in the hands of the Legislature of the United States or America, and I cannot assert even yet that I abandon all hope of any concession in the future, although the movement may be tardy. I believe a change favourable to our Colonies will yet be made by our American Friends.

Your Committee have taken initiatory steps with the view of getting an Agricultural College established in Otago. That such an institution would be of great value to Colonists in this part of New Zealand I think you will agree. When we look around at our rising generation, it would be repugnant to the order of nature to suppose that all of our young men have tastes and abilities to enable them to follow learned professions, or have mechanical genius sufficient to perfect themselves in any of the many noble trades that abound in a manufacturing city like Dunedin. No; it is a wise provision of nature that each of us is not adapted for the same calling. So with our youth, while many have not the bodily physique to labour over the acquirement of a profession or a trade, a healthy out-door occupation pertaining to agriculture may train the boy to become a useful man and a valuable colonist. It is, therefore, desirable that this important question should be followed up until an Agricultural College is firmly established south of the Waitaki. On the whole subject of Technical Education I shall have something to say before I sit down.

Regarding an Associated Chamber of Commerce for this Colony, you will agree with me that this would be a body corporate very much in the interests of New Zealand to establish, and whether its half-yearly or annual meetings were held in one of the chief cities in the North or in the South Island would, so far as its usefulness was concerned, be immaterial. Such an institution as an Associated Chamber for New Zealand I would look upon as one likely to be productive of sound and beneficial results to the Commerce of the country in which we

live. Its meetings and deliberations would, in a measure, assist to practically bridge over that insular separation which nature seems to have invited us to do if we are ever to hope for a closer unity of commercial interests between our two greater islands. In England, at certain periods of each year, the many Chambers of Commerce throughout that great commercial land, send delegates to London to assemble at the Associated Chamber, there to discuss, and think out, questions of vital importance to the well-being of every inhabitant of the United Kingdom, and of equal consequence to the wise Legislation that in many instances is governed by prudent and well-directed proceedings of Chambers of Commerce. If it ever should be possible to have one universal Tariff for our Australasian Colonies, a Federation of interest in that respect, you may depend upon the statement I now make to you, that Commercial Assemblies, such as ours, and of which we are but humble members, will have much to do hereafter in bringing about such a desirable state of things, quite as much so as the Zolverein undoubtedly had in the construction of the great German Empire.

It has long been evident to your Committee that very unnecessary delays occur in the delivery of goods from ships in Port, and consequently serious losses, not only to our Mercantile and trading classes, but also to the owners of vessels coming here. That a deficiency in wharf accommodation in our immediate neighbourhood has much to do with the evil, I admit, but your Committee being most anxious to discover a remedy for it, appointed a Sub-Committee to deal with the whole question. That the course adopted was a wise one, I need only refer Members to the Report brought up, and which is embodied in our proceedings of to-day. In my humble opinion, a more able and practical Report has never come before the Chamber. I commend it to the careful perusal of all who have not yet read it, and I trust that Members will continue to use every effort within their powers until the recommendations contained therein are carried out.

I now come to the second class of questions, in which a little progress only has been made during the year, viz:—The Otago Central Railway, Bankruptcy Amendment Act, and Bills of Sale. Regarding the Railway works, while I am able to report only moderate progress for many months past, it is satisfactory to be able to say that a considerable sum has been included in the Government estimates for public works for the year towards pushing on this great Arterial line; and, looking at the steady increase of *bona fide* settlement now going on in this part of New Zealand, much of which is in the direction of the track of the Otago Central Railway, I live in hope, that even the most bitter opponent to the prosecution of the work in former days, will now be prepared to give support to a useful national scheme that is destined ere long to become the harbinger of much benefit to the trade and Commerce of this City.

In the matter of the Bankruptcy Amendment Act and Bills of Sale, we have felt for a long time past that improvements were necessary in the modes of proceedings in connection there with; and while the legislation now busy in Wellington points to an immediate alteration for the better in such cases, I am fearful that much room for improvement will still exist. A lessening of the vicious credit system, particularly for amounts below £100, in my opinion, would go a great way in rendering unnecessary a frequent operation of either Bills of Sale or Bankruptcy Laws.

I now come to the third class of important matters that have engaged the attention of your Committee during the year, and with which satisfactory progress has been made viz.: Refrigerating Works, Direct Steam Communication with Great Brittan, Central Railway Station, Dunedin; Jetty Street Crossing, Harbour Board's Amended Regulations, on Collection of Dues, Earlier delivery of Northern Mails, Law Procedure Act. Regarding the first great and new industry, it is a pleasure to report that our Refrigerating Works are now in full operation, and doing good work. Members I hope will excuse me in speaking in the possessive sense of these works, as I cannot forget that they count one of the useful undertakings which have been initiated by this Chamber during the last two years. It is expected that the first cargo of frozen sheep from the Company's Works will be ready for export during the end of this month, and the new steamer "Marsala" is now in Port receiving the shipment. As I told you on a former occasion, commencement of this modern industry would open up a prosperous era for New Zealand, and embrace in its fruitful results many classes of pursuits and trades. It must not be supposed that, by adding to the value of live stock and dairy produce, we are only directly benefiting the Land owner. I think like the schoolmaster the economist has been abroad in this Colony sufficiently, already, to have taught our people sounder politics. If we can enhance the selling values of the products of our lands, there need be no fear of the future of New Zealand,—where nature has been bountiful, both in soil and climate.

Allied to this industry is the instituting of a Direct Monthly Steam Service with Great Britain. I need not tell any gentlemen here that the success of the former will greatly depend on the establishment of the latter scheme; you will, therefore, join with me in deploring the want of unanimity that existed a few days ago among Members of the House of Representatives, in not giving support to the vote of £40,000—as an annual subsidy—for a direct Steam Service; and let us hope that the Government, notwithstanding the reduction of the vote, will wisely devise ways and means in connection with immigration, to have a suitable service set in motion before Parliament is called together next year. Whether as an agency for the fostering and extension of trade, or for promoting a stream of immigration of the right class, I feel convinced that even £60,000 per annum

would be monies well and profitably spent in the interests of this Colony in thoroughly establishing a first class Monthly Steam Service with Britain.

It is satisfactory to remind you that the question of Dunedin Central Railway Station has been finally settled, and I have reason for hoping that the work of erecting the new buildings will shortly be proceeded with. The erection of large new goods sheds has already been commenced.

The vexed question of Jetty Street Crossing has also been disposed of happily, partly by the aid of your Committee in having suggested a transfer of the Bridge Crossing to Police Street.

After many Meetings between your Committee and a Committee of the Harbour Board, and much discussion of utility to the question, the Amended Regulations on the Collection of Dues have been agreed to, and the rates now fixed at an increase of one shilling per ton—whether on tonnage or measurement, making the charge now equal to three shillings per ton. If our District is to rejoice in the possession of a Harbour Board endowed with valuable trusts and important powers—with the responsibility of performing and completing a great work for the enlargement of our trade and Commerce; then, gentlemen, the simple moral is, we must be prepared to be called upon to contribute fair rates for the increased advantages that we hope to receive by an improvement of our Harbour and Shipping facilities. I am glad to report that through the courtesy and attention of the respective Heads of Railways and Post Offices here to representations made to them by your Committee, an earlier delivery of the Northern Mails by one hour and a-half has been established which is a step towards the advancement of the interests of the community it is our duty to protect.

The Supreme Court Law Procedure Act has become a Statute of the Colony, to take effect from the beginning of next year, and by it we hope that a cheapening and expedition of the hitherto expensive and tedious proceedings of our law courts will have been gained for the benefit of those who unfortunately may be compelled to resort to such a mode of settlement of difficulties that from time to time are sure to arise, even amongst the best regulated and right thinking communities. It would weary you to give here an abstract of all the clauses contained in the new Act, but one interesting to you all is that solicitors will be permitted to make a contract for the conduct of a suit for a *fixed* sum, somewhat similar I think to a provision in the English Attorneys' and Solicitors' Act, 1870, so that those who wish to fight at law may know beforehand what their bill of costs will come to. Picture to yourselves tenders being invited by advertisement in the usual way, from gentlemen learned in practising the law, for the supply of legal advice for one year to this Chamber. We are, indeed, living in an age of progress, and I presume there is no immediate necessity to appoint our solicitor until tenders have first been called, received, and opened.

Before I leave this subject, I would like to say a few words on *Tribunals of Commerce*. They are most useful offspring of Chambers of Commerce, and their functions are mainly to arbitrate and settle commercial disputes without the aid of law courts. From a recent Chamber of Commerce journal I have taken the following, which may be interesting to you.

TRIBUNALS OF COMMERCE

GERMANY.—Mannheim.—The business done by the Tribunal of Commerce during the last five years may be illustrated by the subjoined figures:—

DISPUTES.

Disputes. Year. 1877. 1878. 1879 (until Oct. 1). From Oct. 1, 1879, until Dec. 31. 1880. 1881. Pending. Settled. Standing over. New. By judgment. Otherwise. 60 89 58 40 32 563 475 271 160 613 570 324 339 190 87 415 386 210 167 124 41 206 163 Left. 89 58 15 40 32 53

Dresden.—Before and after the Commercial Code had been put in force, the Dresden Chamber of Commerce has done all in its power to preserve the Tribunals of Commerce. The said Code left the choice of Tribunals of Commerce in connection with the Courts to departments of justice of each State They are competent in the districts where they are created, within the same limits as the Courts to which they are attached—that is, for all matters above 300 marks (£15), specified in Sec. 101 ff.; a member of the Court as president, and two commercial judges, are sufficient to give judgment in such a manner that each has the same number of votes. Eight such tribunals have been created in Saxony by the Regulation of October 1, 1879, which are divided as follows among the towns of the kingdom:—Two in Dresden, two in Leipsic, one in Chemnitz, Plauen, Glauchau, and Zittau; the other towns requesting similar institutions were refused on the plea that there would not be sufficient business for those tribunals to allow of their formation. The tribunal in this town counts since 1881 six commercial members and two substitutes, allowing of frequent alternation and apparently showing the success of the institution.

And now you will be able to judge of what is thought of such tribunals in Germany. I therefore commend the matter to your wise consideration, in the hope that you will shortly see your way to ask assistance from the Legislature, with the view of having such a tribunal established in Dunedin.

Technical Education, or instruction, is another subject worthy of the best attention of Members of this Chamber. In France, Germany, Austria, and Belgium, the Chambers erect and maintain schools and technical colleges, they subsidise evening lectures to working men, and free classes of book-keeping, drawing, arithmetic, stenography, &c. On the same important subject, the journal referred to says:—Since the principle of individual liberty has interfered with the old custom of apprenticeship, something must be done either by private, municipal, or legislative action, to train up our youths for the trades to which their parents' position, or their own special aptitudes, predestine them. One particular advantage of early training of hand and eye, and familiarity in the use of tools, is to develop the inherent capacities in such wise as to permit an unfailing selection of the most suitable career for each individual pupil. Much future disappointment and loss of time may thus be spared by improved education, whilst the tone of every branch of trade will be raised by the accession of carefully trained members, bringing the whole force of sympathy and enthusiasm in their work to bear on all their surroundings.

While I admit that our Chamber is yet in its infancy for grappling with too many or too great questions, I feel it my duty to supply you with material for careful thought and action hereafter when our Chamber is ripe for it. Another subject, hardly less important to our political economy in the future, has occurred to me to lay before you, and it will be for you to decide whether it is worthy of being recorded hereafter among our minutes. In this city we have the usual schedule of rates and taxes, from the city rate to the special, from the gas to the water rate, that haunt our footsteps one by one, each with regularity in its respective turn during our City Council's financial year, and it is just on the cards that we may yet have an *electric* rate to pay; but, notwithstanding all these rates, there is another I would like to see enacted, and that is a *city fire rate*, whereby every building in our city, whether of large or small value, might be covered by insurance to the extent only of the city valuation and no more. It seems to me that such a system of insurance against fire would have many advantages besides lessening the number of fires—too many of them disastrous to human life—that occur annually in our city. The fact of buildings being covered only according to the values placed upon them by the proper city officer would be a wholesome guarantee that there would never occur any cases of insurance above value. The system would also necessitate a *positive fixity* of fire risk upon all city buildings on the *ad valorem* principle. It is not for me now to say how this proposal could be worked out and managed, I have merely offered the suggestion for the thoughtful consideration of all concerned.

I will now turn the current of my address for a short distance to avoid being tedious, and place before you a few facts and figures that will, I feel sure, be interesting to you and every other person having at heart the well-being of the Provincial District of Otago. Referring first to the trade of our Port, I find that our imports show an increase of nearly half a million in value on the previous year, while our exports have apparently decreased to the extent of L35,000. The latter is more than accounted for by increased shipments of produce made at Bluff Harbour, Campbelltown, and Oamaru, that, previous to the extension of our railways, found its way to Port Chalmers.

The Shipping Returns of our Port exhibit an increase of over 59,000 tons on the preceding year, while our registered tonnage at present in steamers is upwards of 12,000 tons, this latter fact is accounted for by our port being the head-quarters of the handsome fleet of steamers belonging to the Union Steam Ship Company of New Zealand.

The amount of Revenue collected at the chief ports of Otago from shipments at Dunedin, Invercargill cum Bluff, and Oamaru, for the year, appears L499,338, or equal to fully one-third of the sum total received for the whole Colony, and being an increase on the previous year for this District of over L16,000. Now as it is quite clear that Otago gathers in at the present time one-third of the total revenue of New Zealand, I here ask all interested in the progress of this portion of the Colony to use both influence and efforts to obtain a *fair share* of the general expenditure of the state towards our local requirements. We certainly pay one-third of the revenue and we also contribute one-third of the entire exports.

In connection with the pastoral interests of the Colony I am glad to point, for the first time, to a marked improvement in the number of sheep. We have added during the year one million to our flocks, this I think may be accounted for mainly by the improved condition of much of the grazing lands through the continuous and wholesale destruction of rabbits, and partly by new settlements of small holdings, which latter show an increase of 200 settlers. This is evidence indicative of greater attention being given to an improved system of sheepfarming by the order of rotation of crops, and also the probable future outcome to be looked for from the stimulus already given to our meat markets by the refrigerating industry. The estimated number of sheep in the Colony is 12,800,000. The wool shipments from our three Otago Ports have been as follows:—

and the value of the wool shipped from Otago and Southland is equal to nearly L1,200,000, somewhat more than *one-third* in value of the whole export of this product from New Zealand.

Agriculture has not been neglected by our colonists during the past year, and while the increase of acreage put under wheat appears only to the extent of 40,782 acres, making a total of 365,715 acres producing that

cereal, and growing an average per acre of $22\frac{3}{4}$ bushels. A very large falling off is apparent in the area under oat crop—nearly one-half compared to the quantity sown during the previous year of 1880-1881. The acreage of land sown in oats appears 243,887, yielding an average of $28\frac{1}{2}$ bushels per acre. In barley we had nearly 30,000 acres under crop, giving an average of $22\frac{1}{4}$ bushels per acre, while the potato crop for the year covered 22,540 acres, and yielded the excellent average of nearly $5\frac{1}{2}$ tons per acre. With the exception of the last-named crop the yield per acre has been somewhat diminished, attributable partly to the fickleness of the seasons, but chiefly, I am disposed to think, to indifferent husbandry. Compared however with our Australian sister Colonies, which have in the past year, as in many preceding ones, suffered severely from dry seasons, we have reason to be thankful that although our national debt is large, it is easily borne while our climate shuns a much greater enemy to the progress of any country in the shape of devastating periodical droughts. New Zealand must therefore continue to offer much greater salutary benefits to the *boâd fide* settler than any other Colony in Southern Asia.

The mining industry continues to grow in importance in our Colony. From our districts alone up to the end of June last, since the beginning of the gold discovery, we had exported 4,134,837 ounces, valued at L16,283,843, and for the past year Otago has exported nearly 50,000 ounces, of the value of about L200,000. Our quartz reefs seem to be continuing a steady yield, and looking to the several very valuable new reefs on the West Coast, and nearer, in the neighbourhood of Lake Wakatip, and recently opened up, I am still of the opinion that the unearthing of our gold resources is even yet young in its infancy. An increase to our population, and with it additional enterprise, will gradually assist to unfold the long-hidden mineral riches with which this country has been blessed.

Akin to this industry, and of no lesser value to New Zealand and its future greatness, in a commercial point of view, are the vast coal fields of the Colony, and I feel sure that you will agree with me when I say that the Government of this country are not doing their duty towards it, nor to those who have been induced to become colonists, in having allowed, at this period of the country's settlement, the necessity to exist for the importation of 130,000 tons of coal from Newcastle, New South Wales, chiefly to Port Chalmers. Our own coal fields, therefore, do not show that increased output for which we certainly had a right to look at this date; nor can any beneficial advancement from this source towards the revenue of this Colony be anticipated until the Government do their duty, and set to work in a practical way to have improved quickly our West Coast Harbours. The waste of time and—what our American Cousins are pleased to call—"gush," that occur by the appointment of Select Committees; the taking of the same evidence year after year, and the final bringing up of a Report seems to be the Omega of all that legislation has hitherto done in this direction. We want something more practical than this done—and that speedily—if the country is to benefit during our lives by the millions of money Value in the richest of coal deposits now lying in its natural bed, and only waiting to be conveyed to market. The difficulties that block the way where the fine coal exists on the West Coast, are the Bar Harbours, which are easily capable of being made most useful for the purposes of Commerce. It is only a matter of money, and this whole question to my mind has assumed such a national character, and promises such national advantages in the ways of an enlargement of both Commerce and Revenue to the country, that I feel, whether the early opening up of these great coal fields for the trade of foreign shipping cost the State one, or even two hundred thousand pounds immediately, the outlay would be a mere bagatelle in comparison with the advantages that would be gained to this Colony. And, moreover, any money expended in that direction would soon be returned manifold by a marked increase to the general revenue of New Zealand. In leaving this important subject for the present, I venture to hope that all Chambers of Commerce throughout the Colony will take the question up during the present year, so as to bring the forces of united action into play to assist in producing the benefits such as I have tried here to indicate are necessary. Upon our entire system of Railways, let me first Report with satisfaction that the revenue has increased equal to 17 per cent., with also a corresponding decrease in the expenditure. The working returns show a slight progressive improvement on those of the former year; and the earnings are now equal to $3\frac{3}{4}$ per cent., against $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, last year on their total cost. An additional 120 miles have been opened since our last Annual Meeting. I may remark here that a very general impression exists that the present rates charged, both for passengers and goods are higher than they ought to be, and were the Government to reduce the rates, a great expansion of receipts would follow. I think it right to say that I do not share in that feeling; but I would do so if a steady stream of immigration now flowed towards our Shores. With an almost stationary population, however, the aspect of such a change becomes very different, and the probable result more doubtful. If our people are ambitious enough to have great Public Works proceeding throughout the country, they mean the expenditure of large sums of money on which interest must be paid; and, in proportion to the number of our people, will each individual taxpayer learn to behold his or her responsibility. It is as broad as it is long. There are only so many to pay taxation at present and a certain sum to be made up. If you have not extra people to induce to travel, and extra Commerce to travel for, I think that a large reduction now in our Railway Tariff would mean a large addition to some other Tariff; so that while class

against class might be set fighting, the political economy of the country would not be benefitted without a well-balanced increase to our population.

In the new Loan Bills now before Parliament, and out of the monies to be raised therefrom, an allocation is to be made towards several Public Works in Otago, the chief of which in importance to Commercial interest here, in my opinion, is the early resumption of active operations on the Otago Central Railway. If this Railway or *Track* had to be made in America—where 10,000 miles of Railroad are not thought too many to make in one year,—looking at the many valuable mineral and other resources of the country that exist contiguous to the line, it would be completed within six months. The total length of Railroad now open for traffic in New Zealand, I may state at 1400 miles. As bearing in a direct manner on our Railways, I desire to say a few words upon the subject of population. It will be satisfactory for you to observe by the figures placed before you to-day, that the white population of the Colony now number 507,788 souls, being an increase of 15,000 during the year. Otago and Southland claim 139,067 of the whole, while the City of Dunedin and Suburbs count 42,794 of the latter. The backbone of any country gentlemen, is population; then, how essential and necessary is it for the well-being of New Zealand that the number of its inhabitants should be multiplied, and as quickly as possible. I really sometimes makes me despond, when I think of our fruitful country, and of the comparatively few fellow beings it at present contains. I am not prone to be jealous but I candidly admit such a feeling gains upon me when I read of the many many thousands that form the exodus of one single year to depart from Great Britain to the United States, Canada, and even the Argentine Republic. Why is it so? Do those countries offer better inducements and facilities to the immigrant than New Zealand? Do they offer climatic advantages or superior resources to those we are enabled to place within the reach of the enterprising Colonist? No. On the contrary. I am bold enough in answering my several interrogatories, to say that this Colony, viewed by its circumstances and surroundings, offers a home more desirable for the industrious settler, than the countries I have named; and the chief and almost only reason why New Zealand is seemingly neglected, is its distance from the great centres of population, and the entire absence of proper and comfortable facilities to travel from thence to its shores. Each of the countries to which I have just referred has at least weekly direct Steam Communication from Britain. We have been modest in having tried to induce the Government to arrange only a *Monthly* similar Service, and until we get that properly established, we must remain content to take a *back seat*, and merely get a *dim vista* of the great *spectacle* of Colonisation.

The Maori population now numbers 44,097, in addition to Europeans.

Let us now for a short time see ourselves—not as others see us, but—as we are in reference to the Industrial Statistics of the Colony, and the progress made in that respect within the last three years. During that time we have increased our manufactories by 372, and they now number 1,643. There are employed in those establishments, 6,200 males, and 1,339 females; and the values of the lands and factory buildings pertaining to them are 1,1,993,000, besides L1,612,000 in machinery and plant. In the three years referred to, the male employe's increased by 2,472; and the females, by 890 while the additional monies expended in lands, buildings, and machinery make a total of L553,933. Such figures form the strongest evidence, both circumstantial and real, of the progress of New Zealand.

It is proper, before I conclude my remarks, that I should refer to the Banking returns of the Colony, and as they appear to me satisfactory, I may do so briefly. The total deposits in the hands of the Banks at the present time amount to L9,378,938, which are almost equally divided between the two classes, interest bearing and not bearing interest accounts. The monies belonging to the former class most probably claim as proprietors those persons not immediately engaged in trade, while the latter class points to monies directly more active in the everyday operations of commerce.

In the Savings Banks of the Colony, I find by a return given to the 31st December last, that there were L1,549,115 on deposit, belonging to 61,054 depositors, and giving an average to each of L25 7s. 7d. This state of things, in itself, cannot be regarded otherwise than a wholesome one for a new country. It exhibits a saving rate per head that will compare favourably with any other community in the world. With the deposits of the Joint Stock and the Savings Banks together, we can sum up a grand total of upwards of eleven millions of money held by our chief monetary institutions. I think that we may accept the figures as useful evidence of a fair condition of prosperity existing in New Zealand.

On the grave question of taxation it is not my intention to say much to-day. Nothing new in relation to it has been done since I met you a year ago, therefore on this occasion I think that we should "let sleeping dogs lie." I will merely here remind you that the taxable capital value of property in the Colony under the Assessment Act amounts to L81,284,000, inclusive of exemptions of L500 and under in value equal to L10,855,510.

An interesting return will be found among the proceedings of to-day, showing all mortgages under the Land Transfer Act during the two years ended with March last. For the last year such loans have increased in the Colony L3,555,704, which can be accounted for mainly by an extension of pastoral and agricultural interests

both in the North and Middle Islands. I regard the *increment* as an element of progress, although possibly, at the present time, *unearned*.

The National Debt of New Zealand at the close of June last, after deducting accrued sinking fund of L2,317,776, appeared L27,729,835, from which a cash balance remained in hand on 30th July last, of L662,425, to be expended. If we deduct the cost, up to the present time, of constructing our railways, say at L10,000,000, there will then remain as a National Debt, L17,729,835, which has been incurred by the costs of other public works, such as roads, bridges, and public buildings, &c. A large sum has been spent in Maori wars, of which, let us hope we have heard the last Trump sound.

Before we separate I wish to refer to another new industry, and one in which I think we should take an early interest: I allude to co-operative dairy-farming. There can be no doubt that the advantages to be offered by the refrigerating system to the dairy farmer promise equally well in his direction as they appear to do for the cattle and sheep breeder. During the year 1880 the estimated total value of cheese and butter produced in America exceeded L72,000,000, and of this large production 45,000 tons of cheese and 38,000 tons of butter were exported from that country. Then why should New Zealand not make a respectable show of such commodities among her exports? The process only requires to be carefully initiated and properly established throughout the Colony to ensure its success. I referred last year to the probability of the telephone being brought into use in this city. I am able to report that it is now generally used, and, for the convenience of members, communication with the principal public and mercantile offices in Dunedin can be attached in a moment. It may interest you to know of what is being done by the aid of THE TELEPHONE IN SWITZERLAND.—"A report of the Zürich Telephone Company shows that practical telephony has taken a new and useful development in Switzerland. Besides two central bureaux, to which there are about 400 subscribers, there are a number of telephone offices open to the public. Any one may, by paying a small fee, enter one of these public offices and speak through one of the central offices with any of the subscribers. For a *minimum* price, the telephone is at the disposal of any casual customer for a quarter of an hour. There are 11 of these public offices, located in booths along the streets. The company have also established a commission service. The office receives the orders of subscribers, and executes them at the rates charged by commissionaries. They have also established safety apparatus against housbreakers during the night. The central offices will also undertake to awake any subscriber at any hour without extra charge. Another important arrangement is the connection of the telephonic network with the central telegraph office of the city. Thus, any subscriber may dictate his telegram to the telegraph *employé* and save the time that would be occupied in sending a messenger with it. Moreover, when a telegram arrives, it may be telephoned to any subscriber to the company. During 1881 there were transmitted 8,914 telegrams by telephone. One would imagine that the State would be grateful for having the time of its *employés* thus saved; on the contrary, however, every telegraphic message transmitted by telephone is taxed 10 centimes. So that there are many ways by which we will yet be able to make the telephone more useful to us.

I feel it my duty again to refer briefly to the question of a Sailors' Home. I think it behoves us as a commercial community to do something for the *shore* comfort of that class of brave men who so frequently risk their lives for the safety of ships, cargoes, and passengers. As I previously told you there is the nucleus of a fund provided already in the hands of gentlemen here for the purpose of forming a Home for Sailors, and it will make no difference in the future beneficial results of such an institution whether it be established in this City or at Port Chalmers. I mention the subject again to-day in the hope that Members will not neglect much longer to deal practically with it.

On the question of Chambers of Commerce in Britain, I submit to you an extract taken from the Chamber of Commerce Journal of July last, showing the total revenue and expenditure of its leading associations of this kind:—"We have prepared a table from the annual reports of our principal Chambers, showing the total revenue and total disbursements of our leading associations. It is very far indeed from being a nationally creditable statement. Were it not thus clearly before us we might legitimately doubt the fact that the united expenditure of the largest towns of England and Scotland combined towards the support of their Chambers of Commerce hardly reaches L5,000 per annum, less than was paid the other day for Marie Antoinette's writing-table. Dublin alone, it will be observed, contrives to disburse over L2,000, almost half the expenditure of the rest of the kingdom. The following are the figures in question:—

What comparison is there between these small sums and the present state of our Chamber? Looking at the age of our City and its number of inhabitants, we compare favorably with the above, and I may fairly congratulate you that for the first time since my connection with it, our Chamber is out of debt, besides having a small balance to its credit. It is, however, still necessary that Members should bestir themselves in trying to strengthen the funds of our Association, that it yet may be in a better position to perform more useful work in the future than it has accomplished in the past.

I fear, gentlemen, that I have wearied you, but the interest I have taken in the honorable responsibilities with which you have entrusted me for two years I offer as my excuse, and I desire heartily to thank the

Vice-President, the Committee, and the Secretary for the generous support, on all occasions necessary, accorded to me.

Before the proceedings of to-day are finished, you will be called upon to elect your Officers for the ensuing year, in the room of those retiring under the rules of our Chamber.

I now beg to move the adoption of the Report.

Dunedin Chamber of Commerce.

Receipts and Expenditure to 1st July, 1882.

Receipts.

Examined and found correct,

John Davie,
Auditor.

DUNEDIN,

1st July, 1882.

H. Houghton,
Secretary.

Comparative Table of Imports and Exports for the Port of Dunedin for the Years ending June 30th, 1880, 1881, and 1882, respectively

Countries. From 30th June, 1879, to 30th June, 1880. From 30th June, 1880, to 30th June, 1881. From 30th June, 1881, to 30th June, 1882. United Kingdom Australia India .. China Mauritius United States Canada Othor Countries Imports, £1,421,887 419,657 33,200 52,257 198,732 93,430 6,956 £2,136,119 Exports. Imports. £1,224,807 £1,255,482 315,037 10,644 4,202 £1,554,690 439,969 30,657 86,690 117,101 106,918 12,377 £2,049,194 Exports. £1,313,651 282,170 11,568 665 4,328 £1,612,382 Imports, £1,714,129 377,226 73,587 65,162 159,835 134,558 1,176 7,450 Exports £1,300,577 257,372 6,832 12,067 £2,533,123 .£1,576,848

Customs Revenue Returns for the year ended 31st March, 1882, for all Ports of Entry.

Total value of Imports into New Zealand -£7,457,045 Total amount of Duty 1,470,107 Total value of Exports 6,060,866 Of which was collected at—Dunedin Invercargill and Bluff Oamaru Being an increase on the previous year of £435,685 13 0 45,476 0 0 18,177 0 0 £499,338 13 0 £16,065

Return of Shipping at the Port of Dunedin for the Year ending July, 1882.

Foreign Intercolonial Coastwise Total Tons. Tons. 85 Vessels = 62,539 In, and 42 Vessels = 39,236 Out. 153 = 86,920 117 = 75,783 691 = 122,491 748 = 148,944 929 271,950 907 263,963

Registered Tonnage of Colonial Owned Vessels, Port of Otago.

Return shewing the number of Foreign and Inter colonial Vessels Entered and Charred at New Zealand Ports during the

year ending 30th June, 1882.

Being an increase of 48,905 tons on the year.

Gold Exported. *Return of Gold Exported from 1st April, 1857, to 30th June, 1882*

Exported for the year ending 30th June, 1882, 114,253 ozs., of the value of £456,215, of which Otago exported 49,070 ozs., of the value of £196,562.

Return of Sheep and Lambs in Otago and Southland, May 31, 1881.

Wool Shipments.

The National Debt of New Zealand.

From which deducting cost of construction of Railways, £9,944,137, from the total indebtedness of £27,729,535 leaves £17,785,698 as the National Debt of the Colony at the present time apart from Railways.

Railway Revenue over Expenditure is approximately estimated up to 30th June last. The amount realised on the estimated cost of the Railways is £3 18s. 2d. per cent, per annum, and there are evidences of improvement in that direction.

Railways.

Population.

Being an estimated Increase during the year of 15,104 on total population of Colony.
The Maori population is 44,097 in addition to the above.

Banking Returns.

For the Quarter ending June 30th 1882.

Deposits.

Being an increase of £252,847 on the Year.

Savings Banks.—GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE.

Total Amount of Deposits in the Colony at the end of Year 1881, £1,549,115. Depositors, (61,054, averaging £25 7s. 7d. each Depositor.

Property Tax Returns.

For the Year 1880 and 1881.

Inclusive of £ 10,855,510 of exemptions of £500 and under in value.

Mortgages Under the Land Transfer act.

Returns shewing the mortgages under the Land Transfer Act during the last two years, The following are the amounts, shillings and pence omitted:—

Agricultural Statistics.

In Otago the average reached 25¾ bushels Wheat to the acre.

In Otago the average reached as high as 29 bushels *Wheat* and 37 bushels *Oats* to the acre.

Comparative Returns.

In 1881, South Australia returns 8,606,510 bushels of wheat from 1,733,542 acres, New Zealand in the same year returns 8,147,705 bushels of wheat from 324,933 acres and the yield in that year- was by no means a remarkable one. The returns from Victoria for the same year were 9,719,049 bushels of wheat from 976,416 acres.

Coal Fields.

Output.

Industrial Statistics.

The Industrial Statistics collected during the Census in April twelvemonths have just been published and presented to Parliament, The results they give, as compared with the figures for 1878, when the Dprevious Census was taken out, are as follow:—

The increase in the employment of females in factories is interesting. There were 44 in the printing business, and of these 12 were in Auckland and 13 in Otago. There were seven females employed in flax-mills, live in cordial manufactories, three in meat-preserving works, 21 in wool-scouring establishments, 40 in sash and door works (the bulk in Auckland), and 19 in potteries. The distribution of female labour in manufactories is also notable. Thus, of the 1399 employed in manufactories, 239 were in Auckland, 58 in Wellington, 317 in Canterbury, and 699 in Otago.

Although the returns as to production are 18 months old they are the hist we have, and are, therefore, of interest. In 1880 we made over 28,000,000 bricks, produced 143,000,000 feet sawn timber, scoured 1,163,2351b. wool, preserved 852,7911b. and 201,204 tins of meat, produced 3291 tons of tallow, made 1,400 gallons of neatsfoot oil, boiled down 401,600 sheep, brewed and probably drank 4,874,754 gallons of beer, 637,144 dozen of aerated water, 10,284 dozen of cordials, made 69,281 tons of flour, 7143 tons of meal, 122 tons of paint, 1000 gallons of varnish, worked up 844,6471b. of wool, and made in addition 96,768 yards of cloth, 280,291 pairs of boots and shoes and 7,350 boot uppers, manufactured and cured 655 tons of bacon, 47 tons and 16,439 dozen of fish, started the manufacture of cod-liver oil, made 294,555 bushels of malt, 4440 gallons of wine, and 3291 tons of soap and candles. Such are the bold outlines of the industrial statistics presented to Parliament.—*Oamaru Mail*.

The breweries in the Colony number 99. They employ 526 hands, 218 horses, 169 drays and waggons, and made during the year 4,874,754 gallons of beer. The approximate value of land and buildings is set down at £233,218, and machinery and plant £84,180. In connection with the breweries are 34 malt-houses, turning out 294,555 bushels of malt.

Collieries at work in the Colony number 51—viz., 5 in Auckland, 9 Nelson, 3 Westland, 6 Canterbury, 28 Otago. These employ 484 horsepower, and 992 hands. The output of coal last year was 277,918 tons, exclusive of yield from a number of small mines. Land and buildings are valued at £100,071, and machinery and plant at £121,079.

The quartz-mines at work in the Colony number 84—namely, 28 in Auckland, 2 in Marlborough, 32 in Nelson, 22 in Otago. Amount of horse-power, 1463; hands employed, 1147; quantity of gold produced, 84,184 oz.; quantity of quartz crushed, 98,460 tons.—*Otago Daily Times*.

W. J. M. Larmach,
Chairman,
H. Houghton,
Secretary.

September 12, 1882.

There were also present the following Shareholders: Messrs. D. Blackie, A. W. Bremner, G. S. Brodrick, Hugh Calder, A. D. Denovan, T. Fogo, J. Gray, H. Guthrie, W. Guthrie, R. Haworth, G. H. Marsden, J. Robin, H. E. Shacklock, B. Sievwright, G. A. Smyth, J. Stait, R. Stout, R. Tapper, J. Walker.

Mr. W. Guthrie presented proxies in his favor from Messrs. C. M. Gray, W. Paisley, Thomas Taylor.

At the request of the Chairman the Notice of the Meeting was read as follows:—

In the matter of "The Joint Stock Companies Act, 1860," and the Amendments thereof, and in the matter of "Guthrie and Larnach's New Zealand Timber and Wood-ware Factories Company, Limited."

To the Shareholders of

Guthrie and Larnach's New Zealand Timber and Woodware Factories Company, Limited.

Notice is Hereby Given that an extraordinary General Meeting of the Shareholders of the above-named Company, will be held at the Company's Office, Princes Street, Dunedin, on Tuesday, the 18th day of July, 1882, at the hour of 2.30 o'clock in the afternoon, and that at such meeting it is intended to propose the following Special Resolution:

"That Guthrie and Larnach's New Zealand Timber and "Woodware Factories Company, Limited, be wound up "voluntarily under the provisions of "The Joint Stock "Companies Act, 1860. "'

Dated at

Dunedin,

this

6th day of July, 1882.

*Walter Guthrie,
Managing Director.*

The Chairman:—Well, Gentlemen, you have heard read to you the Notice of the business for which this meeting has been called to-day. It is not a very pleasant one so far as I or any of you are concerned. It will, therefore, best serve the object of this meeting if I relate to the Shareholders how this state of things has come about, and then if any of you have any remarks to make, or questions to ask, I shall be happy to listen to them, and to answer them so far as in my power.

The last time we met was to discuss the question of the Annual Balance-sheet, which, in a sense, was not satisfactory, as it left a large amount to be made up for losses. But, from the Managing Director having reported that the Branches had been closed, and the Company's business relieved of the drag that had so long been placed on it, there seemed better cause for anticipating that the Company would be able to make sufficient profits in the future, so that past losses might be made up. I may say, that when we parted after consideration of the last Balance-sheet, it was thought that if the business improved to a reasonable extent, since those drawbacks or suckers—the Branches—had been disposed of, the affairs of the Company had a better chance of reviving than had been afforded them since the commercial panic of 1878, caused mainly by the failure of the City of Glasgow Bank. However, for some reasons, best known to themselves, whether owing to impending changes in the financial barometer, and of which they might have warning, or to the probability of the money market being tightened, or other reasons, our Bankers recently sent this Company notice that its account must be reduced considerably. They suddenly communicated with the Directors of this Company with that view, and addressed a letter to them which I will have read to you presently. Under these circumstances your Directors looked about and considered seriously as to ways and means in order, if possible, to meet the views of the Bank. They were most wishful to do this, because in one respect their Bankers had been indulgent in the extreme, and almost lavish in kindness, so far as giving the Company whatever monies were wanted. But I need hardly tell you, that when dealing with such large figures (for they are undoubtedly large figures), it was impossible for your Directors to take such steps as would satisfy the Bank, and they had therefore to communicate with the Inspector of the Bank, and say to him that nothing could be done unless by the Company taking the course which it is now proposed to do. It was clearly seen and unmistakably shown to us that the only way of meeting their views in order to find the amount of money required by the Bank, would be to put the whole concerns of this Company into liquidation, hence this present meeting. I may say distinctly, that the course the Bank has taken was never anticipated, or the Directors would have felt themselves bound to have indicated such to the Shareholders on the occasion of our last meeting. At any rate, I, as Chairman, would have done so, and made known to Shareholders that such an event was possible. It is not, of course, for us to say what our Bankers' reasons are for their present action in this matter. Their reasons are doubtless very good according to their own view of the question. No doubt, as prudent Bankers, they have considered the question fully, and from every point of view, before writing their letter of the 14th June last. It is not, certainly to my mind, surprising that they should have written in that way, as the figures are indisputably large, nor is it for us

here to ask from the Bank the whole of its reasons for this step. It truly could not be said that the figures were new to our Bankers, or that they had suddenly grown large, and the Bank had been taken by surprise, so that we may presume that the Bank had no doubt given the whole matter very grave consideration; and, therefore, it may be said that we have no right to find fault with our Bankers' decision. Their letter to the Company is as follows:—

Bank of New Zealand, Dunedin,

14th June, 1882.

THE MANAGING DIRECTOR,

Guthrie and Larnach's New Zealand Timber and Woodware Factories Company, Limited.

DEAR SIR,

I am instructed to state that my Directors require a large reduction in the indebtedness of your Company to the Bank, and I am to request your Board to take such measures as will presently effect this.

I am, dear Sir,

Yours faithfully,

(Signed),

GIBSON FERRIER,

Manager.

On receipt of this the Managing Director, Mr. Guthrie, interviewed the Inspector of the Bank, and the result of that interview, I gathered, was to make it plain that there was no middle course that could be taken. The Bankers professed anxiety to study the interests of our Shareholders so far as to suggest and recommend a voluntary liquidation, but they seemed determined, and said so, that liquidation must take place, in the hope that they might be able to call in as much of their money, and in as short a time as possible. The whole matter was very seriously thought of by your Directors in all manner of ways for days, with the single object of saving as much of the Shareholders' money as might be possible under the circumstances. Lastly, your Directors determined to address a final appeal to their Bankers in our Shareholders' interests when the situation appeared to them a *sine qua non* that liquidation—voluntary or official—must take place. I will now read to you the letters referred to.

Dunedin,

June 22nd, 1882.

DEAR MR. MURRAY,

I have been waiting to see Mr. Larnach, but up to the present he has not arrived.

Mr. Sievwright thinks it would be better to go for complete liquidation than to run the risk of disposing of the ironmongery without the consent of Shareholders. I am quite agreeable to this course, and have no doubt Mr. Larnach will be also. That being so we had better see to the reduction of Bank figures in every other way possible before liquidation. I presume you do not wish us to proceed further in the direction of calling a meeting until you return from Christchurch, when Kelsey and Co. and other matters will have been settled.

Yours faithfully, (Signed),

W. GUTHRIE.

Manager.

Bank of New Zealand, Dunedin,

22nd June, 1882.

WALTER GUTHRIE, ESQ.

MY DEAR SIR,

I have yours of this date. The determination of the Directors is no doubt a judicious one. Let the meeting be called at once. I want it to be held and over before I go North. Give such notice as your Articles require, allowing time to get proxies from Auckland. The Directors having determined to go for complete liquidation, the Bank prefer an independent liquidator, and would not assent to voluntary liquidation unless the person appointed had its approval. This could be easily arranged.

Now that the course has been decided on let there be no unnecessary delay The question of figures is of very minor importance. The arrangement with Kelsey can easily be made in the interim.

I suppose you could hold the meeting early next month—say about the 4th or so.

*Yours truly,
(Signed),*

*JOHN MURRAY.
Inspector.*

Dunedin,

27th June, 1882.

*John Murray, Esq., Inspector Bank of New Zealand, Christchurch.
DEAR SIR,*

I am in receipt of your letter of 22nd inst. in reply to mine of same date, and regret to notice that you have treated as official, what was meant to be, and was, merely a private note. You must have mis-understood me when you say the determination of the Directors is, no doubt, a judicious "one." The Directors had not come to any determination. I merely said that I had mentioned the matter to Mr. Sievwright, who thought it would be better to go in for complete liquidation rather than detach the Ironmongery without the consent of Shareholders.

Your letter, however, was laid before the Directors at an informal meeting held to-day, and the subject of liquidation fully gone into.

I was then deputed to write and ask you to kindly lay the position again before your Board for re-consideration.

The position is not likely to become worse, and everything apparently points to a change for the better. Trade is improving, and the value of property increasing considerably, and to liquidate the Company at this juncture, when probably the property assets would not realise more than one-third of their value, would, I feel sure, cause Shareholders, with much reason, to conclude that their interests had not been sufficiently studied.

Mr. Larnach, as you are aware, is largely interested in the concern, holding somewhere about £64,000 of fully paid-up shares, and he is naturally averse to a complete sacrifice of his entire interests, in addition to the private securities held by the Bank, more especially as he feels with me, that now, that the unprofitable branches have been cut off, the Company has a chance of righting itself.

The Directors are most anxious to reduce the Company's indebtedness to the Bank, and to meet this, would consider the advisability of detaching the Ironmongery, provided a suitable purchaser could be obtained, and that the price was satisfactory, and this, with the disconnecting of Paisley and Company and Kelsey and Company, and their discounts, would reduce the indebtedness by about £150,000.

The Directors feel, however, that they could not conscientiously, in the interests of Shareholders, consent to voluntary liquidation at present, as although the Company has not been a successful one during the last three years, and the properties, which form a considerable portion of the Company's Capital, may have deteriorated on that account. As to their market value at the present time, the forced disposal of them just now would mean a complete sacrifice, while on the other hand, if time were allowed, I have no doubt they would realise their cost, or, at all events, a considerably larger amount.

In conclusion, seeing that the operations are now confined almost entirely to Head Office, and the chance of further loss reduced to a minimum, I would ask you to consider whether it would not be advisable in the interests of all parties to let matters continue as at present until the end of the current financial year, five months of which have already expired, when, should it be found that the position of the Company had not improved, liquidation might then be gone on with. Failing your ability to comply with this, however, I trust you will see your way to suggest some medium course which will be more in consonance with the interests of all concerned.

I am, dear Sir,

Yours faithfully,

(Signed),
WALTER GUTHRIE,
Managing Director.

Assistant Inspector's Office, Bank of New Zealand, Christchurch,

29th June, 1882.

*WALTER GUTHRIE, ESQ., Managing Director, Guthrie and Larnach's New Zealand Timber and Wood ware
Factories Company, Limited.*

DEAR SIR,

I am in receipt of your letter of 27th instant.

I was not aware that I had treated your Mr. Guthrie's letter of 22nd instant officially, nor am I now aware upon what grounds Mr. Guthrie concludes that I did so.

As to your letter now under reply, I can but repeat what has again and again been verbally conveyed to you, viz.: that the Bank's determination to require a large reduction in your Company's indebtedness is absolute. Ample time has already been afforded your Directors to adopt measures in co-operation with the Bank for realisation of your Company's assets in a way calculated, as far as possible, to conserve the interests alike of creditors and shareholders.

Any further delay to meet the Bank's requirements will oblige the Bank to take action in its own interests only, and if the interests of the Shareholders suffer in consequence, the responsibility will rest with their Directors.

While wishful to avoid writing in a manner which might be regarded as unduly peremptory, it is necessary that I should request your Board to understand that further delay cannot be permitted.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed)

JOHN MURRAY,
Inspector.

You have just heard the letters read, and the gist of our present position is there. As regards the allusion to the ironmongery business, it was a proposal made to your Directors by their Bankers to lop off that portion of the business and dispose of it if a fair price could be obtained. But your Directors did not think that they would be justified in disposing of such an important limb of the whole *corpus*—such a chief part of the Company's business—without the consent of our Shareholders, and for that reason, among others, they thought it better on the whole to consent to take steps to bring about a voluntary liquidation, and with that view they have called you together to-day to explain the position of matters to you. There is, I think, no more at present for me to say. The whole history of this sudden change in the Company's existence is now explained, and it only remains for me to put the resolution, which is now in your hands, to the meeting; and if any Shareholder wishes to ask me any questions, I shall be happy to answer him. I will put the resolution now, but before taking your votes upon it I will give sufficient time for questions to be asked and for remarks to be made in relation to the business before you.

The resolution was then put by the Chairman to the meeting as follows:—"That Guthrie and Larnach's New Zealand Timber and Woodware Factories Company, Limited, be wound up voluntarily under the provisions of "The Joint Stock Companies Act, 1860," and was seconded by Mr. Haworth.

Mr. Robin enquired whether it were intended to have these proceedings reported.

The chairman explained that at present it was not. It would be necessary if they passed the resolution before the meeting to-day, to hold another meeting not sooner than a month hence, and if, in the meantime it went forth to the public that the Company's affairs were to be hurriedly wound up, it might be supposed that the assets could be bought for little or nothing. The Directors wished to avoid doing anything that might tend to depreciate the value of Shareholders' interests, hence their reasons for not wishing the proceedings of the meeting given to the Press just now.

(After a few minutes' pause)

The Chairman said:—Well, gentlemen, from your silence I gather that no one among you is in a position to

help us, and that no one has any suggestion to make to prevent the course proposed being taken. Consequently, I see no good reason for delaying any longer putting the Resolution to the vote, and I will now put it again.

Mr. R. Tapper: I would like to say a few words first, Mr. Chairman. I may say that I have tried to get as much information as to the carrying on of the Company as I could, but you are all well aware that I laboured under a disadvantage in being so far from head-quarters, that I could not always attend the meetings. When I did look into the affairs of the Company lately myself, I imagined, as far as I could see, that it was, in Shareholders' interests, insolvent. I may tell you that I was not surprised at the Bank acting in the way it has recently done, but I am very much surprised that it did not take this course before. They know best why they did not. Perhaps it was on account of the last balance-sheet which opened their eyes as to the position of the Company. I would like, however, for a distinction to be drawn between myself and any previous Directors. I beg to state that the means by which the Company has been brought into its present position I have had no hand in. I do not wish to blame the Directors. Multitudinous causes have brought affairs to their present condition, but I consider that they are not free from blame. The Company's business has been carried on in an unfortunate manner, and the General Manager of the Company has not had that support from either his fellow Directors or the Shareholders that he should have had. I do not know that I am required to state how I get my conclusions, but I have thought, gentlemen, that you have not looked after your own interests sufficiently, and that we have all got our deserts—(Cries of Oh !) Some one says Oh! but I say if you will not look after your own interests no other person will do it for you. I know very well the causes that have brought this about.

Mr. Robin: Let us hear them, then. Not having Mr. Tapper among the Directors before, was one, perhaps.

Mr. Tapper: For one thing, there were too many people here receiving an indirect interest from the Company, and it was not likely that they were going to set themselves in opposition to the Company. Their interest, I say, has been in an indirect manner. Other Share-holders, again, have been working for the Company—far too many—and it was not likely they would oppose the Company. They had too much to lose; it was their bread and butter. Coming to Mr. Larnach, our worthy Chairman, I have no fault to find with him. He has had a large interest in the concern, but he has not taken part in the management sufficiently to protect himself. The other Directors I will not say anything about, but they never should have allowed the Company to get into the state they had. They knew on what basis their Bank advances were obtained, and they should have known more of the position of the Company than the Shareholders. It seems astonishing how gentlemen can come before the Shareholders and make promises like they have done, saying that we might hope for better returns next year, when it now appears impossible. The affair was, in fact, in a bad way before I joined it, and I hope you will remember that I have had nothing to do with this state of affairs. Some little time ago I asked the Directors for certain information, and they threw obstacles in the way of my obtaining it, saying I should have to bring it before a meeting of the Board of Directors, of which I was one.

The Chairman: Was it not said as well by letter that you could have it by calling at the Company's office.

Mr. Tapper: My answer was that the people who elected me to the Board of Directors to look after their interests never thought it was part of my duty to hunt through the Company's books for any information I wanted. My time is valuable, and I have not the same opportunity of inspecting the books that others have. Another thing I will mention; I think, at the time the Christchurch and Invercargill Branches were bought from the Company—knowing who bought them—the first thing the Directors should have done was to choose another General Manager for the Company. The present one, Mr. Guthrie, had a practical interest in propping up those two branches. It was antagonistic to the interests of the Company that their General Manager should be interested in two branches outside this Company, and I cannot say why they have done it.

The Chairman: I will say a few words in answer to Mr. Tapper It is perhaps as well that I should, and I will deal with his last remark first—that about our General Manager having an interest in those branches. It was some time ago, as I mentioned, determined by the Shareholders that the branches should be got rid of, if only a purchaser could be found willing to give a fair and proper price, and the only way by which a purchaser could be got to give that price, and the Bank induced to agree to such a transaction, and to lend its assistance thereto, was by Mr. Guthrie taking an interest in the said branches. Under these circumstances the Directors had no other alternative, and agreed to sell. If Mr. Guthrie chose to place himself in that position we had nothing to do with it. No other Director cared whether he took part in the purchases or not, provided that the Company's Bankers were satisfied that he should do so, and the interests of the Company were benefited thereby. I personally would not have taken such an interest I must say. I felt as a large Shareholder that it was not in my way. But the prices paid for those branches were good, and if Mr. Guthrie agreed to take a share with responsible parties outside of the Company, and the Company by that means was enabled to sell and get the best prices for its branches, the Directors were bound in justice to the interests of Shareholders not to lose the opportunity of making a sale.

Mr. Tapper: Allow me to correct you, Sir; It was not the buying or selling of the branches that I objected to, but retaining Mr. Guthrie in the position of general manager after the transaction had been completed.

The Chairman: Well, I may say that in any business that has since been done between those branches and the Company, Mr. Guthrie has refused to treat directly. I say that in justice to him. Any such business was delegated to some other of the Company's principal officers. To come to another point in Mr. Tapper's remarks. As to the Bank having been led to take the view of matters they so recently have done from the fact of seeing the last balance-sheet. There also Mr. Tapper is in error, as the Bank was made aware of the probable condition of the balance-sheet before the Shareholders were. Mr. Guthrie was in Auckland at the time, just previous to the Annual Meeting, and he has informed me that one or more of the Bank's chief officers were made aware of the approximate figures. As to the Bank not knowing the position of the Company, as referred to by Mr. Tapper, I look upon that statement as hardly worth discussing here. I was, as many of you know, absent from the Colony for about two years. I had been, unfortunately, taking part in politics at the time the Company came into existence, and from one cause and another I was seldom in Dunedin, except for a few days, just prior to my taking my departure for England at the end of February, 1878. I was absent for about two years, and the mischief had been done before my return. I can, however, say this much—that I believe during the whole of that time, and ever since, the Bank has had a more intimate acquaintance with the affairs of this Company than any single Director excepting Mr. Guthrie. I include even any of the former Directors, and so far as their knowledge of the position of this Company is concerned, I can say that I had occasion to write to the Bankers of this Company from England, and I pointed out to the Bank (early in 1879) that they were giving too much money into the hands of the Company for opening branches, and that I would not be responsible for the consequences. I wrote at least on three occasions in that direction during 1879. I would not have alluded to this fact, but for the remarks of Mr. Tapper, and I now do so in justice to myself, so that the Bank and I may be put in our relative positions and that we may better understand one another. Then as to Mr. Tapper's remarks to us as Shareholders, that we all deserved what we were likely to get, whatever that may be. I can only say that if we do, I will get a great deal under the circumstances; but I must say, at the same time, that I think this Company has had throughout its career, as fair attention and close watching from its management as any Company that was ever formed in New Zealand. Mistakes have been made it is true, but Mr. Guthrie, I am informed, never entered into any important transaction in connection with the Company and involving much money without first consulting the Bank, and I am not prepared to say that any one else in Mr. Guthrie's position would not have made mistakes. I am not one of those who, when misfortunes in which I may be interested arise, put all the blame on the management. I believe, at present, that things have been managed for the best, although I think very great mistakes have been made. The first of these was the opening of branches, and that step was taken for the best, and certainly against my wishes and protests. I think no shareholder will be ungenerous enough to cast blame upon the Directors for that; they had confidence in Mr. Guthrie's management, in his practical knowledge, and the large stake that he personally held in the Company. No doubt he has erred in judgement, but I am not prepared to say that any other man would not have made somewhat similar mistakes. As to deserving what we have got, I can only say, and in proof of my sincerity, that when the transfer was made of my late firm's business, and I had shares—a large number—£50,000 worth—allotted to me for that sum in actual cash I had paid in, I never sold a single share, but took up and paid for about £14,000 worth more, and kept them as an investment in the concern. I did this in the interests of the Company, and I would have been satisfied to look forward to getting 5 per cent, for my money. I should not have minded, if the business could not have paid more, so long as the Company was progressing, and, that is why I left my money in the business. It has now turned out a misfortune so far as I and you all are concerned, but I feel that there is no use in crying over spilt milk, and I am prepared to share my lot with even the smallest shareholder in the Company.

Mr. Tapper could only say that he thought it was discreditable on the part of the Bank, if, as the Chairman said, they knew so well the position of the Company, that they should be a party to the Shareholders being misled as they had.

The Chairman: I think you must be making a mistake, Mr. Tapper. I should not like to say, nor could I, that the Bank would lend itself to anything discreditable. I think we must agree that the Bank has acted in good faith and for the best throughout. It has tried, I have no doubt, so far as possible, to study the Company's interests, and I think it honestly hoped that the business of the Company would improve, and that it would work out gradually from its difficulties. Whether, if the Bank had not taken its recent action, it would have altered matters in the future, I am not prepared to say. The Bank may, for all we know, see some fearful panic in the distance, or the state of the money market may be such as to force our Bankers to take this step. But I feel bound to say this much, that I believe our Bankers throughout have acted in the interests of the Company and to serve the Shareholders, so far as in their view of matters they thought themselves justified.

Mr. Tapper: I allude more to the value that has been placed upon the assets. I should not like to make you more disconsolate about matters than you already are. But I do not think the Shareholders have much idea of the real value of these.

The Chairman: I don't quite see the reason or force of Mr. Tapper's remarks. By the last balance-sheet the

assets are only shown at their actual cost, less depreciation written off from time to time. There has been nothing added to them during the past year beyond what outlays and stocks actually cost. That is done, I think, quite justifiably, with the view that year by year they would work down as the Company went on and prospered. Of course any assets must suffer in a case like this. If you press assets into the market now, or hurriedly, instead of in a customary way, and not akin to the nature of the business to which they belong, of course there will be a heavy loss on them. Look at any assets, in this or any other Colony—the Banks for instance—where would they be, even under voluntary liquidation. There is, in fact, no property that would not be affected if it had to come to an immediate sale. Our misfortune is that we are not in a position to be able to work out the assets of the Company as time and circumstances may offer the best advantage of doing so.

Mr. Robin. There has been a good deal of blame thrown on the first Directors, more especially with regard to the opening of Branches. As past events have shown, this was a mistake, but they were opened believing that they would be of substantial benefit, and it was considered necessary as an outlet for the manufactured products of the Company. I have no hesitation in saying that if it had not been for the commercial crisis of 1878, these Branches would have turned out well and been a great success. There would not have been a word of this kind said if all had gone well and we had been able to declare a dividend of 12 percent., but because we cannot, after doing our best for the interests of the Company, and now that we have to go into liquidation, we get a good slating. I am glad, Mr. Chairman, that you, sir, have made the statement you have done as to never having sold any of your shares. Insinuations have been made, and the idea has gone forth that you had secured yourself and were well out of the concern. It would have been better for you if you had, and I am very sorry now to learn that you did not protect yourself when you could have sold them at a premium. Inuendoes have been thrown out against the Directors for selling the Invercargill and Christchurch branches, but they were sold at very high prices, and if I had been either of the gentlemen who bought them, I would not have agreed to give such prices as they did. The Managing Director got a very good price indeed for them, and I think it is a good thing for the Company that they were sold, and I hope the hands they are in now will be able to work them through for their benefit. Instead of the Directors being condemned for selling them I think they rather deserve a vote of thanks from the Shareholders. I think also that if Mr. Tapper's business were sold off suddenly, he would find his assets considerably lessened below his estimate of their value.

Mr. Tapper: I must correct you. I did not blame the Directors for selling the branches, but for retaining the Managing Director at the head of affairs after they were sold. I think the Directors acted very judiciously in selling, and I would have done the same.

Mr. Robin: I do not know why Mr. Tapper would not have retained the Managing Director, unless he thinks Mr. Guthrie would have given these branches goods on specially easy terms, which he has never done. I have been surprised at the high prices charged to those branches. I know Mr. Paisley, of Invercargill, complains loudly of the hard terms Mr. Guthrie drives with him, so much so that he buys largely elsewhere because of this. I also understand Mr. Tapper to say that he has had to wade through the books of the Company for any information he wanted.

Mr. Tapper: No! What I said was that the people who elected me did not expect that I should have to wade through the books. I had not the time at my disposal.

After a pause of some minutes,

The Chairman: As there seems to be no further remarks to be made, I will now put the resolution again as follows: "That Guthrie and Larnach's New Zealand Wood ware Factories Company, Limited, be wound up voluntarily, under the provisions of the "Joint Stock Companies Act, 1860."

Seconded by *Mr. Haworth.*

The resolution was carried *nem con.*

The Chairman: The proceedings of this meeting will have to be confirmed at another meeting to be held one month from this date and it will then be necessary to appoint liquidators to represent the Shareholders.

The meeting then closed with an unanimous vote of thanks passed to the Chairman.

Extraordinary Meeting of Shareholders, 22nd August, 1882.

An Extraordinary General Meeting of the Shareholders of the above Company was held at the Company's head offices, Princes Street South, on the afternoon of Tuesday, 22nd August, 1882 There were present the following Shareholders, viz.:—Mr. Larnach, Messrs. Brodrick, Blackie, Bremner, Braid, Asher, Connell, Lloyd, Henry Guthrie, Walter Guthrie, G. Ferrier (Bank of New Zealand), Gray, Haworth, Jackson, Lees, Mountain, Robin, Stait, Tapper, Sievwright, Selbie, Stout. Mr. Gibson Ferrier also presented proxies in his

favour from the following;—D. L. Murdoch, South British Insurance Co., R. A. Lusher, J. Warnock, J. Dilworth, Brownlie and Co., Wm. Kennington, J. Cooke, Geo. Buckley, J. Dow, A. Dolamore, R. P. Williams, N. King, T. King, W. Shuttleworth, A. Shuttleworth, J. L. Webster, Webster Bros., W. D. Webster, N. J. Honeyfield, W. K. Thomson, J. D. Walker, J. L. Bonnin, J. Melton.

Mr. W. J. M. Larnach, on entering the room in which the meeting was held, said: Gentlemen, I do not know whether it is expected that I should take the Chair to day, I prefer leaving that matter entirely in your hands. That this meeting should be conducted without fear, favour, or affection to any one, I think it very desirable, if it is the wish of a majority of you, that any other gentlemen should take the Chair, that you should appoint him. Therefore I leave the question entirely in your hands.

Mr. Connell moved and *Mr. Brodrick* seconded, "That Mr. Larnach take the Chair."—Carried *nem dis*.

The minutes of the previous meeting were then read.

Mr. James Robin said: Mr. Chairman, before proceeding with the business, of course you have all seen, as well as I have seen, the article that appeared in the Auckland "Herald." In order that the Auckland people may not have an opportunity of saying that this meeting has been held in a hole and corner manner, no matter what they may say else, I beg to move: "That this meeting be adjourned," so as to give the Auckland Shareholders or any Shareholders in New Zealand an opportunity of having a voice in confirming these minutes or otherwise as they think fit. I do not intend to make any other remarks.

Mr. John Gray: I beg to second that.

A Shareholder: Mr. Chairman, have not the Auckland members had sufficient notice for this meeting, that this meeting should be adjourned. Others have to come a long distance besides the Auckland men, and it is inconvenient to come down here?

Mr. Larnach: Of course the notices when originally sent out were sent giving sufficient time as required by the Act, and possibly the Auckland members had not sufficient time to come here to be present at the first meeting. Whether they knew it was necessary to hold a second meeting in order to confirm the proceedings of the previous one I am not aware, but it appears that the notices were sent from here ten days before to-day to the Auckland people which certainly would not give them time to be present here, but the notices were in accordance with the Act.

Mr. Connell: May I ask if there is a large number of Shareholders in Auckland, and if they hold anything like a large interest in the Company?

The Chairman: There are proxies here representing Auckland shares to the extent of 1799 shares. (Mr. Guthrie over 6000 shares). These proxies are held by Mr. Ferrier, representing the Bank of New Zealand. There are about six thousand shares but these include Auckland and New Plymouth shares and other shares held in the North Island. Whether the whole of the Shareholders of the North Island are represented here I am not at present aware. For myself, I may say, I advocated strongly in the first instance that at least a month or five weeks' notice should be given, to enable every Shareholder in the North Island and in the Colony—whether he held five shares or five hundred—to be present here if he wished to be; but I was unable to have my way in that and hence the shorter notice was given which has occasioned those unpleasant remarks to which Mr. Robin has alluded.

Mr. Connell: As I understand the matter, Mr. Chairman, I think there is a general feeling among Shareholders here, that if it were at all possible and convenient to do so, it would be advisable to give those Shareholders an opportunity of having their weight felt directly in any motion that involved the positive winding up of the Company. At the same time, familiar as I am with the Joint Stock Companies Act, I am aware that any delay in carrying out these proceedings is very much in the power of our creditors—the Bank of New Zealand. If the Rank has no objection to the delay that would enable us to have these Shareholders present.

Mr. Robin: The presence of the Northern Shareholders here could not make the slightest difference in the decision of the meeting, still I would not like them to be able to say that we held the meeting at a time when they could not attend.

Mr. Terrier: As representing the Bank of New Zealand in the matter, I should prefer the meeting going on. I may say that I think it is a mistake on the part of Shareholders here to listen to the writings of one man in the Auckland press. The majority of the shares held in Auckland are represented by proxies, and the men who signed the proxies were well aware that the meeting would be held, and are quite satisfied that their interests should be left in my hands.

The Chairman: Does any other gentleman wish to make any remarks in reference to Mr. Robin's motion that this meeting be adjourned to enable the Auckland Shareholders time to be present.

Mr. Tapper: I should like to make one remark. You said that your ideas with regard to the extension of time to be given to Auckland or country Shareholders were not agreed to. I think it would be only just to myself and some of my fellow-directors for you to state from whom this opposition came. As you are aware yourself, I was

not opposed to the delay, but always thought that every Shareholder of the Company should have a fair say over the matters of the Company.

The Chairman: I have no objection to state that as far as the Company was concerned we were in the hands of the Company's Bankers, and it was the special wish of the Bankers that the proceedings should be carried on as quickly as possible, and we were bound to respect the wishes of the Bankers, inasmuch as the Company was beholding to its Bank for its capacity to carry on business in the meanwhile. It was, therefore, entirely in deference to the views of the Bank that the proceedings have taken the shape they have.

Mr. Robin: Having ventilated the matter now, and seeing there are so many proxies here, with the consent of my seconder, I withdraw the motion.

Mr. Gray consented, and the motion was withdrawn.

The minutes of the last meeting, which have been read, were put to the meeting and approved.

The Chairman: The next business, gentlemen, before the meeting, is the following:—"In the matter of the 'The Joint Stock Companies Act, 1860, and the Amendments thereof,' and 'in the matter of Guthrie and Larnach's New Zealand Timber and Wood ware Factories Company, Limited.' To the Shareholders of Guthrie and Larnach's New Zealand Timber and Woodware Factories Company, Limited. Notice is hereby given that an Extraordinary General Meeting of the Shareholders of the above-named Company will be held at the Company's Offices, Princes-street, Dunedin, on Tuesday, the 22nd August, 1882, at the hour of half-past two o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of confirming the following resolutions, passed at an extraordinary meeting of Shareholders of the said Company held on the 18th day of July, 1882. 'That Guthrie and Larnach's New Zealand Timber and Woodware Factories Company, Limited, be wound up voluntarily under the provisions of the Joint Stock Company's Act, 1860, and for the further purpose of appointing a Liquidator or Liquidators to wind up the affairs of the Company, and to distribute the property thereof, and fixing the remuneration to be paid to him or them. Dated at Dunedin this 10th day of August, 1882.'" That is the resolution, gentlemen, which you are called here to-day to confirm. I am very glad that a Shareholder has referred to the remarks that appeared in the *Star* the other evening, copied from the *Auckland Herald*, in reference to this Company. Some allowance should be made for a paper writing in the style it did, as it was uninformed of our proceedings so far, and therefore it was perhaps rather haphazard in making a guess as to circumstances which have brought about the proceedings of to-day. Now, I have noticed in the remarks that appeared in the *Star* that my name has been referred to freely. Well, no doubt, seeing my name is mixed up with the title of the Company, people uninformed might very naturally suppose that I have been a prime-mover and an active manager in connection with the business of this Company. I would not take up your time to-day were it not that I feel it incumbent upon me, and due to my self-respect, to make some explanation as to how far I am entitled to accept remarks, whether complimentary or otherwise, in connection with the proceedings of this Company. I may tell you at the outset, as many of you know, that at the time the Company started here I was then engaged in politics in Wellington, and was called away necessarily to attend to my duties there. That was at the end of 1877, and I remained in Wellington until the early part of 1878, when I had occasion to go to England. I remained in England for two years, returning here at the beginning of 1880. Well, during the whole of that time, I never sat, so far as I can remember, at any Board meeting, not from any distaste to do so—on the contrary, I should have been glad had my presence in Dunedin been available. I may say that after leaving Dunedin I was disappointed to find that this Company was launching out rapidly into what I considered extravagant purchases, in the acquisition of new properties in various directions in this country, to which I entirely objected. I had on several occasions when in England to offer a protest—a severe protest—against the proceedings that were going on in connection with the acquisition of new properties and Branches, but these protests were of no avail to prevent the continuation of the vicious system which has helped effectively to bring about the state of things which you see to-day. I may tell you that when the business of Guthrie and Larnach's late firm was taken over the amount transferred by the Bank on behalf of the Company, which, as I understood then, was to be guaranteed respectively by Mr. Guthrie and myself, amounting to something like £36,000. As far as I remember that sum I was quite willing to guarantee the Bank in taking it over on behalf of the Company. And it was arranged, according to my belief, that a guarantee to that extent should be prepared and signed by Mr. Guthrie and myself. Well, that guarantee as I understood it, was presented to me for my signature when I was here for two or three days on my way to England, in February, on the day, or two days, before I left Dunedin, and I signed a document without reading it over in the hurry of my departure. That document or guarantee as I understood, I will state again, was to be for the amount of the late firm's indebtedness taken over at that time by this Company. I have already told you that I objected to extension by Branches, and I may say that when visiting Dunedin, before this Company had gone much into opening Branches, I protested, and objected to the idea of the extension of the business by Branches, because I held that they could not be properly looked after.

Mr. Guthrie: May I ask when you objected, and to whom you offered your objections?

Mr. Larnach: I offered them frequently to you. You remember when Guthrie and Larnach were in business, I entirely objected to their business being extended by branches.

Mr. Guthrie: The only objection I can remember was your protest against the purchase of the Invercargill property; and we objected to a large purchase you mentioned in California.

Mr. Larnach: I shall be very glad if Mr. Guthrie, when I have finished, will make any explanation he desires concerning anything I have said, or intend to say. I have already told you of my objection to these branches, on account of the amount of money they would consume. While I was in England, it was considered, by the Bank and the management of this Company in this City, desirable to float debentures for the purpose of giving this Company cheap money, and a certain amount of debentures—I think about £70,000—were sent to London to the Bank of New Zealand for that purpose. I was communicated with in London by the Bank to call at the Bank in reference to these debentures, I may tell you here, that while in England, beyond occasionally being conferred with by the Agent of this Company, Mr. Petersen, its then Attorney, I took no part whatever, in conducting any business in connection with the Company, that is, in relation to the purchase of goods or anything else, unless I was referred to by him for my opinion; when I gave it so far as to me seemed best. I called at the Bank and found that the debentures had been sent Home for the purpose of being floated in London, and I was asked to sign a letter before the Bank would undertake to float them. I may say that this letter first drew my attention to the actual terms of the guarantee which I have before told you of, and which I considered related only to the advances to Guthrie and Larnach's late firm. But as it appeared to refer also to advances on behalf of this Company, I objected to sign the letter, and consequently had occasion to write several letters in connection therewith, which, if you will bear with me, I will read to you. This first one—the letter for which my signature was asked, in reference to floating Debentures, is dated, London, 1878; addressed "To the Bank of New Zealand, Dunedin."

*To THE MANAGER,
London, Bank of New Zealand, Dunedin.*

1878.

DEAR SIR,

Referring to the Agreement of the 26th day of February, 1878, between Mr. Guthrie and myself and your Bank, by which we have jointly and severally guaranteed the Bank the reimbursement, payment, and satisfaction of all moneys which then were, or thereafter should become owing to the Bank on the account current between Guthrie and Larnach's New Zealand Timber and Woodware Factories Company, Limited, and the Bank, and by which we have otherwise guaranteed the Bank; and, referring also to the Agreement executed to the Bank at the same time by myself individually, to make and execute such mortgage as therein mentioned, I beg to state to you on behalf of the Bank, that the said Agreements and the securities of the Bank, and the rights of the Bank against myself are not, and shall not be, in any way released, prejudiced, or affected by any past or future act on the part of the Bank in promoting the issue of the debentures now proposed to be issued by the above-mentioned Company, or otherwise in connection with the said debentures. On the contrary, I am fully acquainted with the proposal to issue such debentures, and the arrangements respecting the same, and I hereby absolutely confirm all such agreements, securities, and rights.

Yours faithfully,

I refused to sign that letter, and which first raised in my mind the idea that the guarantee referred to was not as I intended it should have been. I wrote then to the Manager of the Bank in Dunedin, as follows, of date, 23rd of October, 1879. This is an extract:—

Extract from letter written by Mr. Larnach, under date London, 23rd October, 1879, to the Manager of the Bank of New Zealand, Dunedin.

"By the way, I was rather surprised and shocked the other day on my return from Scotland to see a copy of a guarantee which I appear to have signed in the hurry of my leaving Dunedin in February, 1878, and to find that the guarantee to your Bank was not what I understood it to be when I signed it, namely, a guarantee similar to the letter which you held at that time, undertaking to hold the Bank harmless from all debts and engagements of the late firm of Guthrie and Larnach at the time of the formation of the Woodware Factory Company, who took over their business. I am aware that I signed the last guarantee on the day of, or the day before, leaving, in a hurry, without reading it, and under the belief that it was only putting into legal shape the original letter which you already held from me, and had I the slightest suspicion at the time that it was the document I find it to be on perusal, I would certainly have firmly declined to sign it, and said, 'Not if I know it.' You surely could not suppose me to be in my right senses to willingly and knowingly guarantee your Bank all

monies which then were or thereafter should become due to it on the Current Account' of the New Zealand Timber and Woodware Factories Company, and of any dealing between the Bank and the Company. I was simply ready and willing to guarantee the engagements of my late firm as they existed when transferred to the Company. And now, like a good and reasonable fellow, please understand that I entirely repudiate the guarantee of the 26th February, 1878, so far as it is inconsistent with my original letter of indemnity to you for my late firm, and I must beg of you most distinctly to bear in mind that I will not be responsible in any way to the Bank for or in respect of any dealings between it and 'Guthrie and Larnach's New Zealand Timber and Woodware Factories Company, Limited.' I have no control or say in the working of the concern, nor do I ever desire to be mixed up with its affairs again. As a single Shareholder in the concern, it is most unreasonable that I should be expected to stand in the position which you desire to look upon me in relation to the Company; so, my friend, as all things have an end, let this have an end also, and I will ever pray."

Mr. Robin: Where did you write that from?

The Chairman: I wrote it from London to Mr. Roberta, the then Manager of the Bank where the Company's account was kept. I am merely reading you these letters to show you what my feelings were with respect to the Company at that time, and I did not want the Bank, nor anyone else, to be misled by my name being used in connection with the Company. On the 24th of April, 1879, I also wrote to Mr. Roberts, as Manager of the Bank, to this effect:—

Extract from letter, under date, London, April 24th, 1879, to the Manager of the Bank of New Zealand, Dunedin.

"Regarding the account of 'The Woodware Factories Company, Limited,' and the advances to which you seem to have good cause of complaint, as a Shareholder, I very much deplore that the advances were ever allowed to get higher in your books than they were when the Company took the business from G. and L., and had I ever been consulted on the question I would certainly have protested against the allowance of any increase. Although one of the first Directors, through my political engagements, I don't think that I was ever enabled to sit at any of the Board Meetings after the floating of the Company, and since I have been in England I determined to resign the seat I held at the Company's Board, and several mails ago I forwarded my resignation to Mr. Guthrie to lay before his Directors, of which, I have no doubt, he has already informed you. I will remain a Shareholder, and take my chance or share with my Co-shareholders, but I will take no further responsibility in any shape, nor will I interfere or take any part, whatever, in the direction or management of the Company's affairs either here or in New Zealand, no more than if I only held 5 shares instead of 10,000 in the concern. I think it is a great mistake to attempt to put debentures of the Company upon this market until it has a share capital subscribed here, but of course this is only my opinion, and perhaps Mr. Guthrie knows much better."

That is letter number two to Mr. Roberts. Well then, to show you the opinion of the Company that the Bank then held—mark you—I say this, that it was not whether I was pleased or not with whatever kind of business the Company chose to do, as it was of no use protesting—a simple protest was of no avail. I do not wish to make out that I could have altered things had I been here, I simply say that, as a matter of opinion on my part, I protested against a course which I thought would bring about very evil consequences, and that course appears to have done so. I have no doubt that the evil was stimulated by the effect of the times, as has been before referred to here, in connection with the failure of the City of Glasgow Bank, of that you are as well able to judge as I am. Now this next letter is from a gentleman, a high official of the bank, and one for whom I had much respect. It is a letter to me dated 15th November, 1878 and it will give you an idea of the Bank's opinion of the concern then, and you will be able to judge from this letter and from mine, that you have heard read, what conclusion I drew in connection therewith.

Extract from letter written by Mr. Murray, Inspector Bank of New Zealand, to Mr. Larnach.

"I have just had occasion to go somewhat fully into the affairs of the 'G. and L. Timber and Woodware Co.' and it has occurred to me that there are some points connected with it on which I might usefully write you. You have an important stake in the concern, and the value of your interest may ere long be doubled, if you can only obtain for it the indispensable financial assistance, failing which, more or less complete collapse is inevitable. It is in short to you a question of £100,000, a sum more easy to be lost than made again. Mr. Guthrie has played a bold game, and so far as I can see, he has done it in a way likely to ensure abundant success, but it is a game which needs a lot of money, and on that point a break-down is imminent. The Company is leaning on its Bankers to an unendurable extent, and failing the importation of fully £100,000 more capital in some form, shutting up all Branches and general curtailment of business is the only alternative, whether, were this done, the Company could be carried on at all at a profit, I doubt; at all events, the inexpediency of doing it, if it can be avoided, is palpable. I put the matter thus before you to convince you, if need be, of the importance of your sparing no effort to place the rest of the shares in London, and to negotiate in addition a debenture loan of say £100,000. Could this be done, I regard it as a moral certainty that your shares would soon be worth 100 per

cent. prem. Something short of this would enable the concern to be carried on without important curtailment, and any considerable sum would be of value. You will not suppose I write thus merely to get the Bank out of a fix, there is enough of realisable stock to pay the Bank, and the question is one of figures only; but it is none the less a pressing one; it might be less so if the Bank's risk were greater. With a fuller knowledge of the condition and prospects of the Company, than perhaps any other outsider has, I have no hesitation in saying that, could it only command the needful capital to see it through, there is no better speculation at present in New Zealand, and I doubt if there is another so good."

That is sufficient, gentlemen, to show the opinion of a gentleman admittedly well versed as to the position of this Company; and I may say, with regard to the sale of debentures and shares, that I took no steps to sell either, for the reason, as I said before, I was disappointed at what had been done in the acquisition of Properties and Branches, I did not believe in the future result, and I was not going to be a party to dispose of either debentures or shares in the London market. The agent of this Company spoke to me one morning in London, and said, "I have an offer for some shares at a pound premium." The mail was in from New Zealand, and that very day I saw by the quotations that these shares were quoted under par here. I told the agent he had better not sell these shares at a premium, and that he had better write and say that he was only authorised to sell them at a premium of a pound, but that he observed from quotations in New Zealand that they were quoted below par, and then if the applicant chose to take them, after that notification, his hands would be clean. That is the only part I ever took in connection with the sale of shares or debentures for this Company in London.

A Shareholder: Have you any objection to giving the name of the writer of the last letter.

The Chairman: That was from Mr. Murray, the Inspector. Well, then, I had occasion to write to Mr. Guthrie, in reply to a letter from him, and I am glad that Mr. Guthrie is here, because he won't feel that I am finding fault with him, and what I have to say, I should like to say to him. I had again occasion to write to him, remonstrating with reference to these branches, and he replied to me that he was not going to have his "policy"—that was the word, his "policy"—interfered with. Perhaps I had no right to find fault with him inasmuch as he was in the position of Managing Director of the concern, and his policy might turn out right. However, I think I was at the same time justified in writing, as I did not agree with him, and this is what I wrote to Mr. Guthrie on the 16th of January, 1879; an extract from what I wrote to him.

Extract of letter from Mr. Larnach, London, to Mr. W. Guthrie Dunedin.

"Regarding the sale of shares and debentures in London market. I don't think that Mr. Petersen will be able to sell either here for a long time to come. Your best plan, I think, is to sell the whole of the first issue in New Zealand, and, should the Company live to see a second issue, one pound per share only should be called, and half of the issue reserved for this market, presuming the whole were subscribed for, there would be £4 per share uncalled capital. People here will lend money at 1 or 1 ½ per cent, cheaper rates upon debentures secured against uncalled capital than against mortgage of land, &c. This is merely my opinion, and perhaps will not accord with your "Policy." I have letters from Messrs. Roberts and Murray complaining of the state of matters, and I am rather amused at their seizing upon me to attack, as if I was responsible. I don't know what they were thinking about to allow matters to get as they are. Why! unless the overdraft is covered by promissory note, or in some other way so as not to show on your balance day, and appear in your balance-sheet, published as a debtor to the Bank of——— for such an amount, a run will certainly take place upon the Bank by those who will consider their deposits much safer in their stockings than invested in merchandise, notwithstanding that it may be drawn along by your fast-trotting, high-stepping 'Policy.' As I have to start immediately for Scotland, I cannot write to Messrs. Murray and Roberts until next month; but you may tell them that I hold 10,000 Shares. I am not a seller, but I will buy no more. I am content to wait and take my share from the Liquidators, when "Policy" has broken his knees."

That was written on the 16th of January, 1879. This is a letter in reply to the letter written by Mr. Murray, an extract from which I will read. It is dated, 22nd May, 1879.

Extract from letter written by Mr. Larnach, London, to John Murray, Esq., Bank of New Zealand.

"I may tell you that I was always opposed to Mr. Guthrie extending the business and opening branches as he has done, and I regret that your Bank ever afforded him the facilities to do so. I was also much opposed to his ever declaring a higher dividend than 8 per cent., certainly not more than 10 per cent, at the outside, and placing all other profits at 'Reserve Fund.' However, I was never able to have my way in this, nor was I ever able to attend a Board Meeting since the formation of the Company. As Mr. Guthrie and I do not agree on several important points in connection with the business, and I am unable to attend the Board Meetings, I have thought it just to the Company to resign my seat as a Director, so that my place may be filled up by a Shareholder able to attend to the duties regularly. It is to be hoped that Mr. Guthrie will lose no time in reducing the ramifications of his business; 5 per cent, dividend would be far more sweet with peace of mind than 12½ without it—'Peace with honour.'"

Well, gentlemen, I am sorry that I have felt called upon in self defence to read extracts from the several

letters to which I have referred. There are other letters which I do not think it necessary to read on this occasion. Those before you are sufficient to show that I was entirely opposed to the *policy* that was being pursued, and that I not only gave notice to that effect to the direct management of the Company, but that I also gave very strong notice to the Company's Bankers, so far back as 1878, very early in the history of the Company; so that if the Bankers had unbounded confidence in the management, and the Company's Managing Director could get whatever monies he wanted and considered necessary, and the Bank agreed to advance them to acquire new branch business, what control could a single Shareholder have in any way? No control whatever,—and therefore I say this, that it is unfair that blame should be put upon the shoulders of any Shareholder not entitled to carry it, whether he be a large Shareholder or a small one. Mind you, I have said nothing hitherto, nor do I now say anything reflecting on Mr. Guthrie's management, beyond that I thought, as results showed, it was sadly misplaced judgment; and there, gentlemen, I leave it, I do not wish to say anything more.

Well, then, I came back from England at the beginning of 1880, and I was some time here before I rejoined the Board I joined the Board again after consideration, because I thought that being here on the spot, and having such a considerable interest in the Company—I had never sold a Share—that it would not look well, my not being on the Directory, and so since then I have been a Director on the Board, and on all important matters of late, so far as I know, Mr. Guthrie has consulted me. But as I have said before, so far as the interests of the Company were concerned, the mischief—for it was, indeed, mischief that could not be remedied or repaired—was done before then. During the last two years here it has been a state of existence for the Company; business has not been such that you could redeem or revive to any great extent any severe loss, nor has it been possible to revive the values of properties or securities. Such has been the state of the Company's existence during the last two years, and since my return from England, I need only say further, that in his management, Mr. Guthrie I believe never lost faith, and I think, that had the Company been allowed to carry on business still—whether it would have proved productive of good results or not—that he would have worked in the belief that he would be able to bring things round. It is only a few months ago that I was induced to give a large amount of fresh valuable securities to the Bank to relieve this Company, chiefly for the last two thousand Shares taken up for me when I was in England, and I was assured that by doing so, it would only be a temporary thing, and that if the Company became in difficulties its Shares would be worth four pounds each. That was certainly last year, but it is only a few months ago; and therefore, when the change of front came suddenly by the Bank, and the Directors were brought face to face with the question of voluntary or official liquidation, I was, I must say, taken by surprise. At the same time, I did not lose my presence of mind, I merely remarked: "Well, whatever is done had better be done decently. If we are to die, we had better have a decent burial."

Mr. Guthrie: Mr. Larnach, may I ask you one question I Who induced you to believe the Shares were worth £4?

Mr. Larnach: You told me on more than one occasion that if the affairs of the Company were forced into liquidation, you thought the Shares ought to be worth £4.

Mr. Guthrie: No, not anything like that figure, as you will see if you refer to the offer I made for your own shares.

Mr. Larnach: You offered me £2 10s. since my return.

Mr. Guthrie: I beg your pardon, £15,000 for the whole of your shares.

Mr. Larnach: With a liability, however, that is the impression I had, if I am wrong I am inclined to think there are other gentlemen in the room to whom you have spoken something in the same strain. I do not know that it is so, but I think it very likely, you were always so sanguine. I am not finding fault with you, I believe that you believed it. Now, regarding the Bank, it is not necessary to say anything further. The Bank is the best judge of its own affairs, but I was surprised when the change of front came and we had to face voluntary or official liquidation. I am glad to see Mr. Ferrier here representing the Bank.

Mr. Ferrier: I am not representing the Bank, but Shareholders.

Mr. Larnach: I beg your pardon, but I presume you are representing the Bank under the shares recently held by you, I do not mean it offensively, I only wish to say this for the information of Shareholders—that the Company's account has been one of some value to the Bank from its commencement Here is a statement of the interest, discount, and exchanges paid since the commencement of the Company down to the end of last month. The interest, discount, and exchange paid to the Bank up to the end of December 31st, 1881, was £79,279 19s.

Mr. Ferrier: How long is that?

Mr. Larnach: That is from the 1st of September, 1877, to the 31st of December, 1881, and the amount is £79,279 19s. From the 31st of December, 1880, to the 31st July, 1882, there has been an additional amount of £37,990, so that during the Company's existence there has been something over £117,000 paid in discount, interest, and exchanges. The amount passed through the Bank's books by the Company—paid in in the shape of bills and cash, amounts from the 1st of September, 1877, to 31st December, 1880, to £1,841,688, out of which

over £453,000 of cash has been paid in. There has also been paid in by cash over £326,000, and additional in bills of over £650,000, so that the account has not been without profit to the Bank, but has been one of considerable value. Now, gentlemen, I have told you nearly all I desire to say on this occasion in reference to my connection with the Company and the Bank, and the interest I hold as a Shareholder. We are going directly to the question of the appointment of liquidators, and, considering the interest I hold and the little part I have hitherto taken in connection with the concern, it will be a question for you to consider whether it would be a proper thing for you to appoint me as representing the Shareholders or not. If you are opposed to that, then, notwithstanding the large voting interest I have, I will respect your wishes so much that I will bow to your decision and not offer myself. But if it is the wish of the Shareholders here that I should take part in it, I shall do what I think is right in connection with the Shareholders' interests. I think that very great consideration is due to the Bank as a large creditor, and while it has not a direct voting interest as a creditor, but only through a Shareholder, we are bound to consider the way it has conducted the Company's account and the consideration it has always given to the Company. I believe the Bank had really the interest of the Company at heart, but while I think we should respect the wishes of our Bankers, and I am inclined to do so myself in every way, at the same time I am bound to say this, that I do not think the Bank is entitled to a larger voting interest in connection with this Company's affairs than the Shareholders. If the Shareholders give the Bank an equal voting interest they will be doing an act of courtesy to the Bank, to which I think they are entitled, but I do not think they should have a balance of power in connection with this concern, and I say this fearlessly, because it is my honest opinion, that whoever are appointed liquidators, if they do their duty to the Shareholders the Bank cannot possibly suffer. There is the best answer; If the liquidators are only appointed by the Shareholders the Bank cannot suffer, because the Bank must be paid before the Shareholders can expect anything. I repeat that the Bank is entitled to and I should recommend the Shareholders to give them a fair say. I think they should be able to have an equal say with the Shareholders, but I do not think that they should have a greater. That is my opinion; I may be giving offence to the Bank by stating it boldly, but I do not care if I do offend the Bank—I do not mean to do so, but if I do I am able and ready to stand the consequences. Gentlemen, with these remarks I leave the question in your hands. I repeat again that the interests of the Shareholders should at least be equally considered with those of the Bank. We all wish the Bank to be paid. I do not want a farthing till the Bank and every creditor is paid, and I believe that all of you if asked would express the same opinion; but I do not want any undue power given into the hands of any creditor as against the Shareholders. Still I say this, that though the Shareholders have the voting power against the creditors, they ought to say to the creditors we will put you on equal terms but will not give you any balance of power.

Mr. Connell: May I ask what the motion before the meeting is?

The Chairman: The motion before the meeting is, "that 'Guthrie and Larnach's New Zealand Timber and Woodware Factory' be wound up voluntarily under the provisions of the 'Joint Stock Company's Act, 1860,'"

Mr. Connell: Is the motion that that resolution be confirmed?

The Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Connell: I beg to move that that resolution be confirmed. I do not hold anything like as large an interest as you, sir; I hold a comparatively small interest, but I have always taken an interest in the affairs of the Company, and am sorry to find we are in the position we are to-day. However, I have devoted some little attention to the position of affairs, and have looked at the accounts, and it appears to me, after reading the account of last meeting, at which I was unable to be present, that we have no option whatever, but to confirm the resolution. The intentions and purposes of the Bank appear to be quite distinct, from the correspondence read to the meeting when it last assembled. With regard to the Company being wound up, it amounts to this, sir, that, if we in any way resist the voluntary winding-up of the Company, the Bank of course is in the position immediately to compel us to wind-up officially; and I think, as you say, it would be more in harmony with decency and order, considering the large space this Company has occupied in the public eye, that these matters should be arranged amicably between the Company and the Bank; and that we should not have the appearance of fighting the Bank, or of the Bank fighting us. With regard to your remarks on the appointment of liquidators, sir, I could not but think unfortunate, the form in which you appeared to place the matter before the meeting. I "would deprecate myself, as a shareholder of the Company, anything like an arrangement by which one liquidator was specially looked upon as representing the Shareholders, and another liquidator was specially looked upon as representing the Bank. No doubt that is the form the matter assumes if we are compelled to wind-up under an order of the Court. The Court then appoints a liquidator at the request of the creditors and another at the request of the shareholders; but, unless I mistake the feeling of the bank, I think they would desire the affairs of the Company to be wound-up in such a manner as would be satisfactory to all concerned. I do not know what the proposals of the Shareholders or Directors are with regard to the appointment of liquidators, nor do I know the proposals of the Bank; but I do not think it would be difficult to fix upon liquidators who would surely be satisfactory to all concerned. I think if liquidators were proposed, who would

be satisfactory both to the Shareholders and the Bank, it would be very much to our advantage to have the matter assume that form. However, that matter will come forward more particularly when the motion comes up for the appointment of liquidators. I beg to second the motion.

Mr. Ferrier: I just wish to say one or two words. Mr. Larnach, as chairman, in making his explanations to the meeting, has referred to what he has called a sudden change of front of the Bank in reference to the indebtedness of the Company to the Bank. Now I think when Mr. Larnach read the letters that were written when he was at home, it must have appeared that this move of the Bank is no sudden change, but that the Company has been pressed for a very long time to reduce its indebtedness. Unfortunately, the Company has been unable to do so, and of course, as an end must come to all things, the Bank was obliged to put its foot down. I think the Shareholders will agree with me that it was no sudden change of front on the part of the Bank. As to the figures Mr. Larnach has given you in reference to the amounts paid for exchange and interest, they are large, but you must remember the amounts were large, I presume Mr. Larnach read them out to impress you with the advantages the Bank has gained, but I do not think the Bank would have had any difficulty in finding investments for its money that would have paid better than it has done by being put into the account of the Company.

Mr. Robin: Might I ask if the Bank have communicated with Mr. Guthrie by writing to him to the effect that they desired the amounts overdrawn to be reduced, not within the last twelve months, but before

Mr. Ferrier: I am not prepared to say how often the Bank has communicated with Mr. Guthrie.

Mr. Robin: But have they done it before the last twelve months?

Mr. Ferrier: I think I may safely say that we have.

Mr. Guthrie: Not officially, Mr. Robin, I think. I do not think there was any previous official correspondence from the Bank on the subject.

Mr. Robin: If that is the case, Mr. Guthrie, I think Mr. Larnach was certainly justified in saying that it has been a sudden change of front.

Mr. Guthrie: It is understood, I should think, from the large figures, no Bank wishes to see large overdrafts.

Mr. Larnach: I may explain that what I meant by a sudden change of front was this, that while I knew that at the time of the failure of the City of Glasgow Bank the Company's Bankers became uneasy, as I had evidence when they sent the debentures home to float, yet, I also knew that the Company had got into a chronic state of indebtedness, and I certainly have no recollection of any official intimation, in writing or otherwise, on the part of the Bank to reduce its account, since I returned to the colony, until this last intimation, which has led to this meeting. That is what I meant by a sudden change of front. I was aware that the Bank would have been very glad to have got rid of the indebtedness of the Company altogether with safety to themselves, but it had come to this, the account was not easily moved, and so the Bank was content to see it struggle on, and do the best it could meanwhile; and therefore having had no previous official intimation to my knowledge from the Bank to reduce the account, I think I was fully justified in saying, and I repeat it, that it was a sudden change of front. Does any other gentleman wish to make any remarks before I put the resolution. The resolution is, "that 'Guthrie and Larnach's New Zealand Timber and Woodware Factories Company, Limited,' be wound up voluntarily, under the provisions of the 'Joint Stock Company's Act, 1860.'" I moved this, and it has been seconded by Mr. Council. Those gentlemen in favour of it will signify the same by holding up their hands.

Mr. Connell: Is the motion not that that resolution be confirmed?

The Chairman: Yes, that it be confirmed. Those in favour of that will hold up their right hands. I ask gentlemen all to vote for or against it.—The vote having been taken the Chairman continued.—I may say that it is unanimously carried.

Mr. A. Lees: I am given to understand that there has been a motion proposed that this meeting should have stood adjourned for a month or five weeks or longer, to give shareholders in Auckland and adjoining provinces a chance of being present at the meeting.

The Chairman: There was a motion to that effect but it has been withdrawn. The next business, gentlemen, is this: It is competent for this meeting or any adjournment of this meeting, or at any future meeting to appoint liquidators. It would be desirable, if you can agree among yourselves to-day, that they should be appointed.

Mr. Connell: As I have been sitting here, sir, the idea has crossed my mind that it would be very important that the liquidators should be mutually satisfactory to the Shareholders and to the Bank. Although the Bank is not directly represented at the meeting, yet the position is simply this: that if we proceed now to elect liquidators who would in any respect be objectionable to the Bank, the Bank has it in its power simply to apply to the Court and have the Company wound up under an order of the Court. Consequently it would be only stultifying ourselves to proceed to the appointment of liquidators that might be distasteful to the Bank. I throw it out as a suggestion, whether it might not be wiser to have a committee, say of three Shareholders, to meet the Bank, confer with them, and ascertain whether they could not agree as to the appointment of liquidators. Perhaps Mr. Ferrier could, on the part of the Bank, make some suggestion. That is the idea that occurred to me,

that of a conference between the Shareholders and the Bank.

Mr. Ferrier: Mr. Connell has asked me a question which enables me to give some explanation of the views of the Bank. Of course if the suggestion which I feel disposed to submit should not meet the views of the Shareholders present, I should have no objection to meeting a committee of the Shareholders. Mr. Larnach has expressed a wish, and no doubt a natural one, to become a liquidator. The Bank has no objection to Mr. Larnach being a liquidator. At the same time Mr. Larnach went on to say that the Bank should not have a preponderating power in the liquidation. The Bank has no wish to have a preponderating power. The Bank is prepared to support as a second liquidator any gentleman in whom the Shareholders have confidence. There is a gentleman in whom I think you all have confidence, he is a Shareholder himself, and has been to a certain extent connected with the Company in the past; that is Mr. William Brown. He is a gentleman who must have the confidence of everybody here who knows him, and he is in a business which makes him very fit for the position. That is liquidator number two. The Bank thinks the interests involved so large that it would hardly do for two liquidators to be left to deal with the Company's affairs, but that three should be appointed, so that they might confer, and that it be understood that two liquidators should have a preponderating power. As the third liquidator I would name Mr. Donald Stronach, of Dunedin. I think he is known to you as a straightforward respectable gentleman—a man to be trusted in every way. These three names I would submit to the Shareholders as liquidators for the Company. Before the voting is proceeded with I would remark that I heard a gentleman say "two would be enough." Two might be enough, but you must remember this that if you have two liquidators only, one voting against the other, you have a deadlock, and that is inadvisable; you have to call the Shareholders together, and considerable delay is involved.

A Shareholder: Appoint three—one to be referred to in case of a dispute.

Mr. Ferrier: It is very true that could be done, but why not appoint three liquidators; if the third has any power he has a voting power, and might as well be a liquidator. It saves any disputes afterwards. If you have a man to refer to appointed, he may be absent when wanted, or many other things might occur. It would be better to have a third liquidator than a referee.

Mr. Robin: What salary would be paid?

Mr. Ferrier: That would be a matter for subsequent resolution.

Mr. Robin: It might have something to do with the number of liquidators.

Mr. Ferrier: I think, considering there would be few creditors to pay outside the Bank, the Bank you may say is the only creditor, that I think, perhaps, a remuneration of one per cent, commission on the available assets would be ample remuneration.

Mr. Stout: What do you mean by "available assets?"

Mr. Ferrier: What is sold by the liquidators?

Mr. Jackson (of Timaru): I quite agree with what Mr. Ferrier says. I think the remuneration should be fixed as he says, and divided amongst the three liquidators. I shall, therefore, second that the three persons named, Mr. Wm. Brown, Mr. Larnach, and Mr. Stronach be appointed liquidators for this Company.

Mr. Ferrier: It was merely a suggestion. I did not move it.

Mr. Jackson: I will move it.

Mr. A. Lees: Will you accept Mr. Connell in the place of Mr. Stronach, he is not connected with any institution nearly allied to the Bank of New Zealand.

Mr. Connell: I would for my part, since my name has been mentioned, say that I would only agree to act, providing a difficulty should arise concerning which the other liquidators could not agree. I should prefer myself not to have anything to do with the liquidation; and I think if Mr. Stronach is acceptable to the other Shareholders, I would rather my name was withdrawn. It would be only providing there was a difficulty I would consent to act.

Mr. Lees: I simply mentioned Mr. Council's name, because I thought perhaps he would be more acceptable to the Shareholders; he being entirely unbiassed in the matter.

Mr. Ferrier: I do not think that Mr. Stronach would be in any way biassed in the matter.

Mr. A. Lees: I do not say he would be, only that impression might be created.

Mr. Stout: Will he act?

Mr. Ferrier: Yes You must remember that Mr. Brown and Mr. Larnach are both Shareholders, and my request that Mr. Stronach be appointed is, I think, reasonable enough, considering that you will have two Shareholders appointed as liquidators. Mr. Council has kindly offered to withdraw.

Mr. J. Robin: I will second the nomination of yourself (the Chairman), Mr. Brown and Mr. Stronach. I think the Shareholders will be very well satisfied. I feel glad that the representative of the Bank of New Zealand (for such we must consider Mr. Ferrier) has proposed such names. I believe that the interests of the Bank and of the Shareholders will be looked after by them better than by any other three gentlemen who could have been named. I have had considerable experience of Mr. Brown's ability and integrity, and I could not

speaking too highly of him. I hope the Shareholders will accept the three names suggested.

A Shareholder:—Would it not be advisable that the Shareholders should know something of how the liquidation of the Company is to be carried on. I think it advisable the Shareholders should know whether the business of the Company is to be split up, sold in one lot, or how?

The Chairman: I should like to say this, gentlemen, and I say again, without meaning any opposition to the Bank, that Mr. Brown is nominated by the Bank as a liquidator as well as Mr. Stronach. I have no objection to either of these gentlemen; in fact I do not know any two I could work better with, but I feel bound to point this out to the Shareholders, that Mr. Stronach represents an institution very, much allied to the Bank, and that the Bank will have a preponderating say, as against my individual say. I am content to accept it if it is the Shareholders' wish, but at the same time I am not going out of this room without pointing out to the Shareholders that by that election the Bank will have two voices to my one. Mr. Connell is not connected in any way, either directly or indirectly, with the Bank, and therefore that difficulty would be avoided by his appointment, or by that of any other gentleman in his position.

Mr. Ferrier: Will you allow me to say a word, Mr. Larnach? You have told the meeting impliedly that by electing Mr. Brown as a liquidator the Bank would have a preponderating say. I think all gentlemen who know Mr. Brown will say that Mr. Larnach is estimating Mr. Brown wrongly. I am sure of this that Mr. Brown will not favour the Bank or anyone else in the liquidation of the affairs of this Company. He is a man above that.

The Chairman: I did not say that he would—I never hinted at it even.

Mr. Ferrier: If Mr. Larnach does not mean that, I do not understand how the Bank will have a preponderating influence.

The Chairman: If Mr. Stronach or Mr. Brown and I disagreed, the decision must be recorded solely by one of the gentlemen you have now nominated.

Mr. Ferrier: Gentlemen, I was asked if I could state the Bank's views. At the request of Mr. Connell I named Mr. Brown. I do not think I can be accused of naming a nominee of the Bank, when in naming him I named one of your own Shareholders. I have no wish or intention or idea of obtaining a preponderating power for the Bank in naming Mr. Brown.

Mr. Larnach: If Mr. Ferrier will state that Mr. Brown has not been communicated with weeks ago by the Bank or by himself I shall be satisfied.

Mr. Ferrier: Mr. Brown has been communicated with. It would be an absurd thing for me to waste your time without knowing whether the gentleman I named would stand or not. I asked Mr. Brown the question, and he said he would stand if elected. Surely it was only a reasonable thing to ask if he would act if elected as a liquidator.

The Chairman: That only bears out, to my mind, that he is a nominee of the Bank.

Mr. Ferrier: I think you will bear me out that he is not a nominee of the Bank simply because I named him. I have named Mr. Larnach, and he is not a nominee of the Bank.

A Shareholder: I suggest that two liquidators be appointed to confer with the Bank on the appointment of another.

Mr. Connell: So far as regards Mr. Stronach personally, I should be prepared to support his election. There is no man in the city I have a more high respect for: however, there is the difficulty Mr. Larnach has stated, that if he and Mr. Brown were elected, if Mr. Larnach and Mr. Brown looked upon a matter differently, the settlement would rest upon Mr. Stronach, and considering he is nominated by the Bank—

Mr. Ferrier: Do not you think Mr. Brown would act entirely in the interests of the Shareholders?

Mr. Connell: I think anything he does will be done in an independent and proper way.

Mr. Ferrier: Then he only acts as a balance between the other two liquidators; if Mr. Larnach and Mr. Stronach oppose each other it is left entirely to Mr. Brown, in whom you have every confidence, to say which side shall win. I think you will bear me out in saying that Mr. Brown will act in the interests of Shareholders and of all concerned.

Mr. Larnach: I still feel it my duty to say that my objection is one largely interesting to the Shareholders, notwithstanding anything Mr. Ferrier has said to the contrary. I say there are no gentlemen whom I am acquainted with, and with whom I would sooner work than Mr. Stronach and Mr. Brown. From what I know of them there can be no possible objection to either of them individually. I will even say they are both more eligible than I am, but at the same time I totally object to the principle. It was said by the Bank that Mr. Ferrier himself would be proposed, but, by being proposed, he would have occupied a wrong position, and now in lieu of Mr. Ferrier we are asked to elect Mr. Stronach. The only possible objection I have to him is his connection with an allied institution. In my opinion it is not an independent election. I say that without wishing to give the slightest offence. I say it because I feel it, and feeling it, I feel bound to say it.

Mr. Blackie: I move as an amendment, "that Messrs. Larnach, Brown, and Connell be appointed liquidators."

Mr. John Gray: I second that.

The Chairman: Well, gentleman, I will put the amendment first.

It is proposed by Mr. Blackie, and seconded by Mr. Gray, "that Mr Wm. Brown, Mr. Connell, and Mr. Larnach be appointed liquidators." That is the amendment in opposition to the proposal by Mr. Jackson, For the amendment twelve have voted. Now for the motion. Those in favour of the motion by Mr. Jackson, seconded by Mr. Robin, that "Messrs. Stronach, Brown, and myself be appointed." Eight have voted. The amendment is carried.

Mr. Stout: You can take a poll by the share list.

The Chairman: The amendment is carried by twelve votes to eight. According to the voting in the room, the meeting is now in favour of the amendment.

Mr. Stout: Section 44 gives the voting power.

Mr. Ferrier: The votes may be given either personally or by proxy. Counting by the poll, I hold that you can count proxies as well.

Mr. Stout: The way to test the voting is this: you should ask the chairman to take the votes according to the shares.

Mr. Ferrier: Yes, I ask you for a poll.

Mr. Robin: While I supported and seconded Mr. Ferrier's motion, I do not see what possible objection he can have to Mr. Council. I am sure he can have none personally.

Mr. Ferrier: Gentlemen, this question has been already discussed. As representing the only creditor, I think I have a right to demand the nomination of a liquidator. The Shareholders have two, Mr. Larnach and Mr. Brown, and surely I can ask you, the Shareholders, to give a large creditor a little consideration in this matter. I only ask for one liquidator, that is Mr. Stronach, and I think I am entitled to do that. I offer this explanation simply because, as Mr. Connell himself says, if the Bank were to appeal to the Court, that would be the course the Court would take.

Mr. Stout: I beg your pardon. The Bank has no power of nomination; the power to nominate lies with the Court.

Mr. Ferrier: I think the rule, at any rate, is that the Court will give every consideration to a large and only creditor, and I think I am asking very little when I ask you to appoint the gentlemen I have named. You have two gentlemen of your own here—Mr. Brown and Mr. Larnach—two Shareholders, to look after your interests, and I think I am making a mild request when I am asking for one.

Mr Connell: I think, now that the vote has been taken, I would ask permission to withdraw for this reason, that I am quite satisfied that if the Bank presses this matter, and has really set its heart on having Mr. Stronach, we can only give way; that the interests of the Company demand that we should give way to the Bank in this matter. I have looked carefully into the Act, and am of opinion that if we once get the Company in an antagonistic position to the Bank, the Bank has us in its power, and that the Court will carry out the views of the Bank. Now, as the Bank appears to feel somewhat strongly about the appointment of Mr. Stronach, I would ask to be allowed to withdraw from the position to which I have been proposed.

Mr. Jackson: I thought in moving the resolution, that the Bank was very reasonable. The Bank, from the correspondence, appears to have acted in a liberal manner, and as the Meeting admits that all those who have been proposed are honourable men, I do not see any objection to their appointment.

Mr. Stout: As a Shareholder, I do not see that the Shareholders have any reason to be very thankful to the Bank for what it has done. The Bank has done what any other monetary institution would do. It has looked entirely after its own interests; and in looking after its own interests, I think it might have allowed the Company to go on for another year or two to see if anything could be got for the Shareholders. It seems to me that just as the Company was about to begin to clear off its indebtedness, the Bank comes down upon it and does not care twopence for the Shareholders. I feel bound to say that, and I also say this, that I do not think the Shareholders ought to be brought in antagonism with the Bank by supporting Mr. Council's nomination. I feel sure that everyone who knows him will know that he would take a proper course, and would not be swayed either by the Bank or the Company. And I can say the same of Mr. Brown. They are both practical gentlemen; they are not interested in the way that Mr. Larnach is in the Company, and would look after the Bank's interest just as well as Mr. Stronach. At the same time, I have nothing to say against Mr. Stronach. I can say the same of him, but I think that except the view of the Bank is that Mr. Council will not act fairly, the Bank ought not to irritate people who have lost their money.

Mr. Ferrier: I do not say anything of the sort about Mr. Connell and as to what Mr. Stout says about the Company having just begun to pay off its indebtedness, I do not think that is a fact.

Mr. Stout: I said, just as they were beginning to see their way to pay it off.

Mr. Connell: I do not think we owe anything to the Bank, I quite endorse Mr. Stout's remarks on that. The Bank, I think, has acted cruelly. It has nearly broken our Manager down. The Company was doing everything in

its power to reduce its indebtedness, and would have been successful, I believe, without loss to the Shareholders. It is not that I feel we are indebted to the Bank a single straw, but I cannot but feel this, that if the Bank made up its mind to treat us harshly, it has it in its power to do it, and if we get into a dispute with it about the appointment of liquidators, the Bank has the power to force Mr. Stronach's appointment. On account of that I think it is better we should give way to the Bank, not that I like it, nor think it clue to the Bankers for their kindness, but simply because they have got the power.

Mr. Lees: In the event of Mr. Ferrier losing on the vote being taken, would he still press for Mr. Stronach to be a liquidator?

Mr. Ferrier: I am not prepared to say until I see the result. It is a thing I cannot do hurriedly. I would have to consult my Board about it. I could not take such a step without consulting the Board.

Mr. Jackson: We shall, I believe, have a better result if we take the suggestion of the Bank than if we are forced into it

Mr. Connell: I would like to say that, while I desire to withdraw, I will not withdraw if it is against the wish of the meeting I should do so I desire, however, to withdraw, and to give way to the Bank, as it is determined to have its way in this matter.

The Chairman. Is there anyone in favour of Mr. Connell's withdrawal? Apparently there is no one in favour of your withdrawal.

Mr. Ferrier: Then I have to demand a poll.

The Chairman: Gentlemen, I will have to ask you to vote on this question again by poll—that is, to give your names correctly. There were twelve for the amendment and eight against it.

Mr. Robin: Will you allow me again to ask you to consider whether you cannot accept the proposal of the Bank. Mr. Brown is a most extraordinary man, one of the most extraordinary men I have met with. He is a most intelligent man; he can form an intelligent opinion upon almost any subject, and can hold his own against some men it is very difficult to hold out against. I have been surprised to see how he could hold his own against a gentlemen who generally gets his own way. I believe that if the Bank of New Zealand were to offer Mr. Brown all their capital it would not influence him in the least. Had they proposed any other person than Mr. Brown I should have been inclined to have gone with you, but as they have proposed him I should like to see the Company give way and accept him. The Bank could have no more influence on Mr. Brown than a drop of cold water on a duck's back.

The Chairman: I think we all agree with that; nor would the Bank, speaking for myself, influence the other liquidators, only I felt bound to tell you, as a Shareholder, that, though he, Mr. Brown, was a Shareholder, he was still a nominee of the Bank, and that Mr. Stronach is concerned in an allied institution. I do not object to Mr. Stronach because he is Mr. Stronach, on the contrary, I should like very well to work with him, but because I think it most unfair and one-sided for the Bank to have two nominees. I may be giving offence to the Bank by stating this fearlessly, but I cannot help that. I accept the responsibility.

Mr. R. Tapper: I take it in this light: as the Shareholders do not expect anything out of the estate, and as there is only one creditor, that is the Bank, what is the use of us fighting it as to who are to be the liquidators? As the Bank is our only creditor, and all the receipts will go to the Bank, how does it matter who is appointed?

A Shareholder: I expect to get something out of it.

Mr. Tapper: I do not.

Mr. Stout: I will sell my shares very cheap.

(The voting on the question of the appointment of liquidators was then taken). *For the motion:*—Messrs. Ferrier (Bank of New Zealand), Walter Guthrie, Henry Guthrie, Asher, Haworth, Jackson, Mountain, Robin.

For the amendment:—Messrs. Larnach, Brodrick, Blackie, Bremner, Braid, Connell, Lloyd, Tapper, Sievwright, Stout, Gray, Lees.

Mr. Jackson: I move that the remuneration be one per cent, on the gross sales, to be equally divided amongst the liquidators.

A Shareholder: I second that; that is one per cent, on the gross assets.

The Chairman: The motion is, "that the remuneration be one per cent, on the gross assets of the Company, and that the same be equally divided."

Mr. Sievwright suggested that the division should be left to the liquidators to decide.

Mr. Connell: There is a large quantity of mortgages; how does the resolution stand worded?

The Chairman: "On the gross assets." Motion put and carried *nem dis*.

Mr. Ferrier: I interpret it in this way: that any properties offered at mortgage to the Bank do not come under it.

Mr. Stout: Certainly they must.

Mr. Ferrier: If the Bank is called upon to lodge its claim, it will, in the ordinary way, lodge its claim, and value its assets.

Mr. Stout: It will be on the gross assets the liquidators may have to sell. If they have the trouble of winding up the assets, it would be unfair to say, if there is nothing outside the Bank, they are to get nothing, If they have first to pay the creditors, and the Bank is the only creditor, then every shilling must be paid to the Bank. People will not work for two years and then be handed a cheque for fifty pounds.

Mr. Ferrier: I assume the position to be this, that if the Bank makes a claim in the usual way—filing assets—that the remaining assets will be realized and commission computed on them.

Mr. Stout: How much does that mean?

Mr. Ferrier: I take it that the remuneration of the liquidators will be about £1500.

Mr. Stout: Fix it at £1500.

Mr. Ferrier: I am prepared to do that.

Mr. Connell: But the other resolution has been carried.

Mr. Ferrier: I have no objection to fix it at £1500.

The Chairman: The motion has been carried without dissent.

Mr. Stout: I do not think there would be much difference.

Mr. Ferrier: I assure you it was entirely under a misapprehension I put it in this way.

Mr. Stout: I cannot understand you. If the Bank get all the money paid before the commission comes in, I think the liquidators will get nothing.

Mr. Ferrier: I think you will agree with me that £1500 will be moderately good payment for the work. If more than £1500 is paid to the liquidators the Shareholders will be losing their money.

A Shareholder: Will one per cent come to more than that.

Mr. Ferrier: Yes.

The Chairman: However, it is no use taking up the time of the meeting, the motion is carried.

Mr. Connell: Seeing that the resolution was passed apparently under a misapprehension, would it not be in our power to authorise the Chairman to delete it, and to put it afresh, receiving any amendment upon it.

Mr. Stevwright: Some might have left the meeting.

Mr. Connell: We surely have the power to delete a resolution passed under a misapprehension.

Mr. Stout: I think you had better leave it as it is. However, you can call a special meeting if you think more is coming. I put it to Mr. Ferrier before, whether it was to be paid from what was coming to the Shareholders, or from the total assets of the Company.

Mr. Ferrier: It was quite under a misapprehension. I support Mr. Connell. I think if there has been a misapprehension the Chairman should be asked to delete the resolution. From the beginning I thought as I said, that £1500 would be good remuneration, and to give more would be quite unnecessary.

Mr. Connell: To test the matter, I move that the resolution just put and carried be deleted from the minutes, and that the question be put again.

Mr. Ferrier: I second that.

A Shareholder: Can that be done?

Mr. Stout: If everybody agrees to it, it may be done.

Mr. Guthrie: It is entirely in the hands of the Bank, as to how they shall deal with their own securities.

Mr. Jackson: If this resolution is put, and one dissents from it, it cannot be carried.

Mr. Stout: I do not think the Bank has anything to fear.

The Chairman: This resolution has been carried, and it appears that unless we are unanimously agreed to have it deleted from the proceedings of the Meeting, that it cannot be altered.

Mr. Stout: Better let it go.

The Chairman: I shall be glad to act exactly in accordance with the feelings of the Meeting on the question.

A Shareholder: I do not think it will come to a thousand pounds.

Mr. Connell: I should like Mr. Stout to tell us whether it is competent for us to put the motion.

Mr. Stout: It seems to me that if a motion is once carried—if everybody is willing, I see no harm in deleting it; but, if any one objects, I doubt whether it could be done. The Bank has nothing to fear—the Bank fixes the terms.

Mr. Ferrier: In what way?

Mr. Stout: They fix the terms in selling the assets.

Mr. Guthrie: Only so far as regards mortgage securities.

Mr. Stout: That in entirely in their own hands.

Mr. Ferrier: That is what I asked.

Mr. Stout: I say that possibly if you call upon the liquidators to pay the money, your right of foreclosure will not be gone. I think the matter may be safely left to the Bank and the liquidators. Better not risk any law. If there is a dissentient vote a Shareholder might move the Court.

The Chairman: The result of the voting by poll is: for the motion, "that Mr. Stronach, Mr. Brown, and

myself be the liquidators," 700; for the amendment, "to appoint Mr. Brown, Mr. Connell, and myself," 327. The motion is therefore carried.

The Chairman: Before going away, gentlemen, I should just like to say a word or two with reference to the article in the *Auckland Herald* referring to "Dunedin Commercial Morality." I do not know that we need look in the direction of Auckland when we wish to find commercial morality. The only commercial immorality brought about by this Company, if there has been any, so far as I at present know, has been caused by mistaken judgment, but I think we have heard of such a thing as commercial immorality in Auckland, in the shape of Tammany rings and other combinations established for the purposes of rabid speculation, and I therefore do not think that those people north can come down here and lecture us on commercial morality. I think we can afford to let pass by without much notice any remarks they may scatter in our direction on that score, when we reflect on the national question of the sale of Native lands, and the many acts of jobbery and corruption perpetrated in that direction in the immediate neighbourhood of that high commercially moral city of Auckland.

The proceedings closed by Mr. Connell moving a vote of thanks to the Chairman, which was carried unanimously, and the meeting dispersed.

Methods of Election.

By PROFESSOR E. J. NANSON. [Read 12th October, 1882.]

IF there be several candidates for an office of any kind, and the appointment rests in the hands of several persons, an election is held to decide who is to receive the appointment. The object of such an election is to select, if possible, some candidate who shall, in the opinion of a majority of the electors, be most fit for the post. Accordingly, the fundamental condition which must be attended to in choosing a method of election is that the method adopted must not be capable of bringing about a result which is contrary to the wishes of the majority. There are several methods in use, and none of them satisfy this condition. The object of this paper is to prove this statement, and to suggest a method of election which satisfies the above condition.

Let us suppose, then, that several persons have to select one out of three or more candidates for an office. The methods which are in use, or have been put forward at various times, may be divided into three classes.

The first class includes those methods in which the result of an election is arrived at by means of a single scrutiny.

The second class includes those in which the electors have to vote more than once.

The third class includes those in which more than one scrutiny may be necessary, but in which the electors have only to vote once.

In describing these methods, the number of candidates will in some cases be supposed to be any whatever, but in other cases it will be assumed, for the sake of simplicity, that there are only three candidates. The case in which there are only three candidates is the simplest, and it is of frequent occurrence. I propose, therefore, to examine, for the case of three candidates, the results of the methods which have been proposed, and to show that they are erroneous in this case. This will be sufficient for my purpose, for it will be easily seen that the methods will be still more liable to error if the number of candidates be greater than three. I shall then discuss at some length the proposed method in the case of three candidates, and afterwards consider more briefly the case of any number of candidates.

METHODS OF THE FIRST CLASS.

In the first class three methods may be placed, viz., the single vote method, the double vote method, and the method of Borda. In these methods the electors have only to vote once, and the result is arrived at by means of a single scrutiny.

THE SINGLE VOTE METHOD.

This is the simplest of all methods, and is the one adopted for Parliamentary elections in all English-speaking communities in the case in which there is only one vacancy to be filled. As is well known, each elector has one vote, which he gives to some one candidate, and the candidate who obtains the greatest number of votes is elected. This method is used for any number of candidates: but in general the larger the number of candidates the more unsatisfactory is the result.

In this method, unless some candidate obtains an absolute majority of the votes polled, the result may be

contrary to the wishes of the majority. For, suppose that there are twelve electors and three candidates, A, B, C, who receive respectively five, four, and three votes. Then A, having the largest number of votes, is elected. This result, however, may be quite wrong; for it is quite possible that the four electors who vote for B may prefer C to A, and the three electors who vote for C may prefer B to A. If this were the case, and the question

That A is to be preferred to B

were put to the whole body of electors, it would be negatived by a majority of two, and the question

That A is to be preferred to C

would also be negatived by a majority of two. Thus the single vote method places at the head of the poll a candidate who is declared by a majority of the electors to be inferior to each of the other candidates. In fact, if A and B were the only candidates B would win; or if A and C were the only candidates C would win; thus B and C can each beat A, and yet neither of them wins. A wins simply because he is opposed by two men, each better than himself.

Thus the single vote method does not satisfy the fundamental condition. It appears also not only that the best man may not be elected, but also that we are not even sure of getting in the second best man. It is clear that if any candidate obtain an absolute majority of the votes polled this error cannot occur. All we can say, then, about the single vote method is that if any candidate obtain an absolute majority the method is correct, but if no one obtains such a majority the result may be quite erroneous.

These results are well known, and consequently in elections under this plan great efforts are generally made to reduce the number of candidates as much as possible before the polling day, in order to avoid the return of a candidate who is acceptable to a small section only of the electors. This reduction can, in practice, be made only by a small number of the electors, so that the choice of a candidate is taken out of the hands of the electors themselves, who are merely permitted to say which of two or more selected candidates is least objectionable to them.

THE DOUBLE VOTE METHOD.

In this method each elector votes for two candidates, and the candidate who obtains the largest number of votes is elected. This method is erroneous, for it may lead to the rejection of a candidate who has an absolute majority of votes in his favour as against all comers. For suppose that there are twelve electors, and that the votes polled are, for A, nine; for B, eight; for C, seven, then A is elected. Now, in order to show that this result may be erroneous it is merely necessary to observe that it is possible that each of the seven electors who voted for C may consider C better than A and B; that is to say, an absolute majority of the electors may consider C to be the best man, and yet the mode of election is such that not only does C fail to win, but in addition he is at the bottom of the poll. This is an important result; we shall see presently the effect it has on other methods of election.

In the case in which there are only three candidates this method is, in fact, equivalent to requiring each elector to vote against one candidate, and then electing the candidate who has the smallest number of votes recorded against him.

BORDA'S METHOD.

This method was proposed by Borda in 1770, but the first published description of it is in the volume for 1781 of the *Memoirs of the Royal Academy of Sciences*. For some remarks on the method see Todhunter's *History of Probability*, p. 433, where the method is described. In the case of three candidates, it is as follows. Each elector has three votes, two of which must be given to one candidate, and the third vote to another candidate. The candidate who obtains the greatest number of votes is elected.

In order to show that this method may lead to an erroneous result, suppose that there are twelve electors, of whom five prefer A to B and B to C, whilst two prefer A to C and C to B, and five prefer B to C and C to A. Then the votes polled will be, for A, fourteen; for B, fifteen; for C, seven. Thus B is elected. It is clear, however, that this result is wrong, because seven out of the whole twelve electors prefer A to B and C, so that, in fact, A has an absolute majority of the electors in his favour. Hence, then, Borda's method does not satisfy the fundamental condition, for it may lead to the rejection of a candidate who has an absolute majority of the electors in his favour.

It may be observed that the result of the poll on Borda's method may be obtained, in the case of three candidates, by adding together the corresponding results in the polls on the methods already described.

If there be n candidates, each elector is required to arrange them in order of merit; then for each highest

place $n-1$ votes are counted; for each second place, $n-2$ votes, and so on; $n-r$ votes being counted for each r th place, and no votes for the last place. The candidate who obtains the greatest number of votes is elected.

Borda does not give any satisfactory reason for adopting the method. Nevertheless he had great faith in it, and made use of it to test the accuracy of the ordinary or single vote method, and arrived at the extraordinary conclusion that in any case in which the number of candidates is equal to or exceeds the number of electors, the result cannot be depended upon unless the electors are perfectly unanimous. This in itself is sufficient to show that Borda's method must be capable of bringing about a result which is contrary to the wishes of the majority.

There is, however, another objection which is of great importance. Borda's method holds out great inducements to the electors to vote otherwise than according to their real views. For if an elector strongly desires the return of a particular candidate, he not only gives his two votes to that candidate, but he also takes care to give his remaining vote to the least formidable of the other candidates. The effect of this is to give a great advantage to second-rate candidates. Thus not only does Borda's method fail to interpret the true wishes of the electors, supposing that they vote honestly, but it holds out great inducements to them to vote otherwise than according to their real views.

Laplace discussed the question of the best mode of electing one out of several candidates, and by an analytical investigation was led to Borda's method.

Journal de "Ecole Polytechnique, cahiers vii. and viii., pp. 169, 170; Théorie Analytique des Probabilités, pp. 101, 299; Todhunter's History of Probability, pp. 547, 548.

He states distinctly that this method is the one indicated by the theory of probabilities. He then proceeds to point out the objection just stated, and expresses the opinion that the method would, without doubt, be the best if each elector would write the names of the candidates in what he thinks the order of merit. We have seen, however, that this is far from being the case.

METHODS OF THE SECOND CLASS.

The simplest method of the second class is the French method of double elections. In this method each elector has one vote, as in the single vote method, already described. If, however, no candidate obtain an absolute majority of the votes polled, a second election is held. For this second election only the two candidates who obtained the largest number of votes at the first election can be candidates. The result is that the successful candidate is returned by an absolute majority of those who vote at the second election, so that it would appear, at first sight, that the successful candidate represents the views of a majority of the electors. We must not lose sight, however, of two facts, first, that all the electors who vote at the first election may not vote at the second election; second, that those who do so vote merely have to choose between the two remaining candidates, and that, consequently, they may not be represented in any sense by the candidate they vote for; they may merely be in the position of having a choice of evils.

This plan has frequently been proposed for adoption in England, and quite recently it has been proposed by more than one speaker in the Legislative Assembly of Victoria. The method is indeed a great improvement on the present system of single voting, and if the election be merely a party contest, and neither side runs more than two candidates, the result cannot be wrong. But if these conditions be not satisfied, the method may easily lead to an erroneous result. The method may be used whatever be the number of candidates; but it is sufficient to show that it is erroneous in the case of three candidates only. This is at once done by a further consideration of the example already given in discussing the single vote method. For in that example C is at the bottom of the poll, and, according to the present system, he is rejected, and a second election is held to decide between A and B, because no one has an absolute majority at the first election. The result of the second election is, for A, five votes; for B, seven votes; so that B wins. In order to show that this result may be erroneous it is only necessary to suppose that the live electors who voted for A prefer C to B. For then, if the question

That C is to be preferred to B

was put to the whole body of electors, it would be carried by a majority of four. Now we have already seen that the question

That C is to be preferred to A

would be carried by a majority of two. Hence, then, this method leads to the rejection of a candidate who is declared by a majority of the electors to be superior to each of the other candidates. This method, then, clearly violates the condition that the result must not be contrary to the wishes of the majority.

We may consider this example from a slightly different point of view. In discussing it under the single vote method, the important result arrived at was that A was inferior to each of the other candidates, and, therefore, ought to be at the bottom of the poll, instead of being at the top, as he was, in consequence of his being opposed by two good men, B and G. Thus, instead of excluding C, as in the French method, A is the one who ought to

be excluded. Having arrived at the result that A is to be excluded, the whole of the electors have now a right to decide between B and C. On putting this question to the issue, we find that C is preferred by the electors.

We see, then, that the French method may lead to error through throwing out the best man at the first election. And this is the only way in which it can err; for if there be a best man, and he survive the ordeal of the first election, he must win at the second, seeing that he is, in the opinion of the electors, better than each of his competitors.

Comparing the French method with the single vote method, we see that in the case of three candidates the worst candidate may be returned by the single vote method, but that it would be impossible for such a result to be brought about by the French method. By that method we are at least sure of getting the second best man, if we fail to get the best.

There is, however, a grave practical objection to this method. It is that a second polling may be necessary. This is of great importance; for in the case where the number of electors is large, as in a political election, great expense has to be incurred, not only by the authorities in providing the necessary machinery, but also by the electors themselves in coming to the poll again. Besides this, the excitement of the election is kept up much longer than it would be if the whole matter could be settled by a single polling. There can, I think, be little doubt that this objection has been one of the chief obstacles with which the advocates of this method have had to contend. Accordingly, we find that the single vote method is employed, as a rule, in those cases in which there are some hundreds of electors, and it would be inconvenient to hold a second election. On the other hand, when the number of electors is small, so that they can all meet together, and remain till a second or third election has been held, the number of candidates is generally reduced to two by means of a preliminary ballot or ballots. This very fact shows that the defects of the single vote method are recognised, because in those cases in which it is considered to be practicable to do so a preliminary election is held, so as to try to avoid the glaring defect of the single vote method—that is, to avoid returning a candidate who is acceptable to a small section only of the electors. It is a mistake, however, to suppose that it is not practicable to hold one or more preliminary elections when the number of electors is large. It is general thought that in order to do so a fresh set of voting [unclear: pap] must be used for the second election, and that this second election cannot be held till the result of the first is known, so that the electors have the expense and trouble of going to the poll a second time. This, at all events, appears to be the practice in France, Germany, and Italy. This, however, is not necessary; for, by a very simple expedient, any number of preliminary elections, on any plan whatever, may be held by means of a single set of voting papers, and without troubling the electors to vote more than once. The expedient is to require each elector to indicate his order of preference amongst all the candidates. Once get this information from the electors, and we can tell how any elector will vote on any question that may be put as to the merits of the candidates. It is here assumed that an elector will not change his opinion during the course of the election. This expedient of making each elector indicate his order of preference amongst all the candidates is necessary in order to carry out Borda's method, which has been described above; indeed, it was suggested by Borda himself. But Borda does not appear to have noticed that it might be made use of for a series of elections without requiring the electors to vote again; this appears to have been first pointed out by Condorcet. The idea of a preferential or comparative voting paper is one of the fundamental ones in Hare's system of proportional representation. We are not concerned with this subject here, as the only question under consideration is that of filling a single vacancy. It is, however, worthy of notice that the preferential voting paper which is such an important feature in Hare's system, is of such old origin, and that it was suggested by Condorcet as a means of filling several vacancies, which is the very question considered by Hare. The method of Condorcet, however, is quite different to that of Hare.

If the expedient here described were adopted, the French system would be free from the practical objection which has been indicated. It would still, however, be open to the objection that the result of the election might be contrary to the views of the electors. Notwithstanding this, the method would be a good practical one for elections on a large scale; it would be very suitable for party contests, and if neither side ran too many candidates, the result could not be wrong. The method, however, would be altogether unsuitable if there were three distinct parties to the contest. Under any circumstances, however, the method would be very little more complicated than the present system of single voting, and it would give much better results. If, however, it be considered desirable to reform the present electoral system so far as to introduce this French system of double elections, it would be as well to at once adopt the method of Ware, described below. This is the same, in the case of three candidates, as the French method, but in other cases it is a trifle longer. No difference whatever would be required in the method of voting, but only a little more labour on the part of the returning officer. The results of this method would be much more trustworthy than those of the French method.

OTHER METHODS OF THE SECOND CLASS.

Before passing on to the methods of the third class, it may be stated that each of the methods described under that heading may be conducted on the system of the second class. In order to do so, instead of using a preferential voting paper, as in the methods of the third class, we must suppose a fresh appeal made to the electors after each scrutiny. This, of course, would make the methods needlessly complex, and, in the case of a large number of electors, totally impracticable. This, however, is not the only objection to the methods of the second class. For if the electors be allowed to vote again after the result of one of the preliminary elections is known, information is given which may induce an elector to transfer his allegiance from a candidate he has been supporting to another candidate whom he finds has more chance of success. A method which permits, and which even encourages, electors to change their views in the middle of the contest cannot be considered perfect. This objection does not apply to those cases in which there are only three candidates, or to any case in which all but two candidates are rejected at the first preliminary election, as in the French system.

There is another objection, however, which applies to all cases alike; it is that, at the first preliminary election, an astute elector may vote, not according to his real views, but may, taking advantage of the fact that there is to be a second election, vote for some inferior candidate in order to get rid, at the first election, of a formidable competitor of the candidate he wishes to win. If this practice be adopted by a few of the supporters of each of the more formidable competitors, the result will frequently be the return of an inferior man.

On account of these objections, I consider it unnecessary to enter into any further details as to the methods of the second class.

METHODS OF THE THIRD CLASS.

In the methods of the third class each elector makes out a list of all the candidates in his order of preference, or, what comes to the same thing, indicates his order of preference by writing the successive numbers 1, 2, 3, &c., opposite the names of the candidates on a list which is supplied to him. Thus one voting only is required on the part of the electors. These preferential or comparative lists are then used in a series of scrutinies; and the methods of the third class differ from one another only in the way in which these scrutinies are conducted. Three different methods, which may be called Ware's method, the Venetian method, and Condorcet's practical method, have been proposed for use, and these will now be described.

WARE'S METHOD.

This method is called Ware's method because it appears to have been first proposed for actual use by W. R. Ware, of Harvard University.

See *Hare on Representation*, p. 353,

The method was, however, mentioned by Condorcet,

Œuvres, 1804, vol. xiii., p. 243.

but only to be condemned. This method is a perfectly feasible and practicable one for elections on any scale, and it has recently been adopted by the Senate of the University of Melbourne. It is a simple and obvious extension of the French system, and it is obtained from that system by two modifications, viz.:—

- The introduction of the preferential or comparative method of voting, so as to dispense with any second voting on the part of the electors.
- The elimination of the candidates one by one, throwing out at each scrutiny the candidate who has fewest votes, instead of rejecting at once all but the two highest.

In the case in which there are three candidates only, the second modification is not necessary. It will, perhaps, be convenient to give a more formal description of this method. The mode of voting for all methods of the third class has already been described; it remains, therefore, to describe the mode of conducting the scrutinies in Ware's method.

At each scrutiny each elector has one vote, which is given to the candidate, if any, who stands highest in the elector's order of preference.

The votes for each candidate are then counted, and if any candidate has an absolute majority of the votes counted he is elected.

But if no candidate has such an absolute majority, the candidate who has fewest votes is excluded, and a new scrutiny is proceeded with, just as if the name of such excluded candidate did not appear on any voting paper.

Successive scrutinies are then held until some candidate obtains on a scrutiny an absolute majority of the votes counted at that scrutiny. The candidate who obtains such absolute majority is elected.

It is obvious that this absolute majority must be arrived at sooner or later.

It is clear, also, that if on any scrutiny any candidate obtain a number of votes which is greater than the sum of all the votes obtained by those candidates who each obtain less than that candidate, then all the candidates having such less number of votes may be at once excluded.

Ware's method has been shown to be erroneous for the case of three candidates in the remarks on the French method, of which it is in that case a particular form. It is easy to see that if there be more than three candidates the defects of this method will be still more serious.

The objection to this method, concisely stated, is that it may lead to the rejection of a candidate who is considered by a majority of the electors to be better than each of the other candidates. At the same time, the method is a great improvement on the single vote method; and the precise advantage is that whereas the single vote method might place at the head of the poll a candidate who is considered by a majority of the electors to be worse than each of the other candidates, it would be impossible for such a candidate to be elected by Ware's method.

To illustrate fully the difference between the two methods and the defects of each, suppose that there are several candidates, A, B, C, D, . . . P, Q, R, and that in the opinion of the electors each candidate is better than each of the candidates who follow him in the above list, so that A is clearly the best, B the second best, and so on, R being the worst. Then on the single vote method R may win; on Ware's method A, B, C, D, . . . P, may be excluded one after another on the successive scrutinies, and at the final scrutiny the contest will be between Q and R, and Q, of course, wins, since we have supposed him better than R in the opinion of the electors. Thus the single vote method may return the worst of all the candidates; and although Ware's method cannot return the worst, it may return the next worst.

A great point in favour of Ware's method is that it is quite impossible for an astute elector to gain any advantage for a favourite candidate by placing a formidable competitor at the bottom of the list. On account of its simplicity, Ware's method is extremely suitable for political elections. In cases of party contests, the strongest party is sure to win, no matter how many candidates are brought forward. The successful candidate, however, will not always be the one most acceptable to his own party.

THE VENETIAN METHOD.

For the sake of simplicity, I describe this method for the case of three candidates only. Two scrutinies are held; at the first scrutiny each elector has two votes, which are given to the two candidates, one to each, who stand highest in the elector's order of preference. The candidate who has fewest votes is then rejected, and a final scrutiny is held between the two remaining candidates. At the final scrutiny each elector has one vote, which is given to that one of the remaining candidates who stands highest in the elector's order of preference. The candidate who obtains most votes at the final scrutiny is elected.

This method is very faulty; it may lead to the rejection of a candidate who has an absolute majority of the electors in his favour. For we have seen, in discussing the double vote method, that such a candidate may be rejected at the first scrutiny. In fact, unless the candidate who has fewest votes at the first scrutiny has less than N votes, where $2N$ is the number of electors, we cannot be sure the result is correct. For, for anything we can tell, the candidate who is rejected at the first scrutiny may be, in the opinion of an absolute majority of the electors, the best man for the post. If, however, the candidate who has fewest votes on the first scrutiny has less than N votes, then the method will certainly give a correct result. For, since there are only three candidates, to require an elector to vote for two candidates comes to exactly the same thing as to ask him to vote against one candidate. Now, if with the two votes any candidate get less than N votes, it is clear that there are more than N votes against him, for each candidate must be marked first, or second, or third on each paper. Thus, in the opinion of an absolute majority, the candidate is worse than each of the other candidates, and, therefore, ought not to be elected. Unless, therefore, the lowest candidate has less than N votes, this method violates the fundamental condition.

I do not know that the method has ever been used in the form here described; but in the still more objectionable form of the second class, which differs from the one just described only by dispensing with the preferential voting paper, and allowing the electors to vote again after the result of the first scrutiny is known, it is exceedingly common, and is frequently used by committees. An instance which was fully reported in the Melbourne papers occurred some time ago in the selection of a candidate to stand on the constitutional side at the last election for Boroondara. It is fair, however, to say that the result of the method appears to have been correct in that case; but that was due to accident, and not to the method itself.

If there be more than three candidates the method is very complicated, and the defects are more serious. It seems, however, hardly worth while going into any details in these cases.

CONDORCET'S PRACTICAL METHOD.

This method was proposed in 1793 by Condorcet, and appears to have been used for some time at Geneva. It is described at pp. 36—41 of vol. xv. of Condorcet's collected works (edition of 1804), and may be used in the case of any number of candidates for any number of vacancies. We are at present concerned only with the case of a single vacancy; and for the sake of simplicity I describe Condorcet's method for the case in which there are only three candidates.

Two scrutinies may be necessary in order to ascertain the result of the election in this method. At the first scrutiny one vote is counted for each first place assigned to a candidate, and if any candidate obtains an absolute majority of the votes counted he is elected. But if no one obtain such an absolute majority a second scrutiny is held. At the second scrutiny one vote is counted for each first place, and one vote for each second place, exactly as in the first scrutiny on the Venetian method, and the candidate who obtains most votes is elected. At first sight we might suppose that this method could not lead to error. Comparing it with the Venetian method, described above, we see that Condorcet supplies a remedy for the obvious defect of the Venetian method—that is to say, the rejection of a candidate who has an absolute majority is now impossible. A little examination, however, will show, as seems to have been pointed out by Lhuillier,

See Montucla's *Histoire des Mathématiques*, vol. iii., p. 421.

that the method is not free from error. For, let us suppose that there are sixteen electors, of whom five put A first and B second, five put C first and B second, two put A first and C second, two put B first and A second, and two put C first and A second. Then the result of the first scrutiny will be, for A, B, C, seven, two, seven votes respectively. Thus, no one having an absolute majority, a second scrutiny is necessary. The result of the second scrutiny will be—for A, B, C, eleven, twelve, and nine votes respectively. Thus B, having the largest number of votes, is elected. This result, however, is not in accordance with the views of the majority of the electors. For the proposition, "B is better than A," would be negatived by a majority of two votes, and the proposition, "B is better than C," would also be negatived by a majority of two votes, so that in the opinion of the electors B is worse than A and also worse than C, and, therefore, ought not to be elected.

Summing up the results we have arrived at, we see that each of the methods which have been described may result in the return of a candidate who is considered by a majority of the electors to be inferior to each of the other candidates. Some of the methods—viz., the double vote method, the method of Borda, and the Venetian method—may even result in the rejection of a candidate who has an absolute majority of votes in his favour as against all comers. It would, however, be quite impossible for such a result to occur on the single vote method, or the methods of Ware and Condorcet.

METHOD PROPOSED.

Having pointed out the defects of the methods in common use, it now remains to describe the method proposed for adoption, and to show that it is free from these defects. It consists merely in combining the principle of successive scrutinies with the method of Borda, and at the same time making use of the preferential voting paper, so that the proposed method belongs to the third class. I propose, first, to describe and discuss the method for the case of three candidates, and then to pass on to the general case in which there may be any number of candidates.

Let us suppose, then, that there are three candidates, A, B, C. Each elector writes on his voting paper the names of two candidates in order of preference, it being clearly unnecessary to write down a third name. If we prefer it, the three names may be printed on the voting paper, and the elector may be required to indicate his order of preference by writing the figure 1 opposite the name of the candidate of his first choice, and the figure 2 opposite the name of the candidate of his second choice, it being clearly unnecessary to mark the third name. In order to ascertain the result of the election two scrutinies may be necessary.

At the first scrutiny two votes are counted for each first place and one vote for each second place, as in the method of Borda. Then if the two candidates who have the smallest number of votes have each not more than one-third of the whole number of votes, the candidate who has most votes is elected, as in Borda's method. But if one only of the candidates has not more than one-third of the votes polled (and some candidate must have less), then that candidate is rejected, and a second scrutiny is held to decide between the two remaining candidates. At the second scrutiny each elector has one vote, which is given to that one of the remaining candidates who stands highest in the elector's order of preference. The candidate who obtains most votes at the second scrutiny is elected.

The method may be more briefly described as follows:—Proceed exactly as in Borda's method, but instead of electing the highest candidate, reject all who have not more than the average number of votes polled. If two be thus rejected, the election is finished; but if one only be rejected, hold a final election between the two remaining candidates on the usual plan.

In order to show that the proposed method is free from the defects above described, it is necessary and it is sufficient to show that if the electors consider any one candidate, A, say superior to each of the others, B and C, then A cannot be rejected at the first scrutiny. For if A be not rejected at the first scrutiny he cannot fail to win at the second scrutiny. Let therefore the whole number of electors be $2N$, and let the number who prefer B to C be $N + a$, and consequently the number who prefer C to B be $N - a$; similarly, let the number who prefer C to A be $N + b$, and therefore the number who prefer A to C be $N - b$, and let the number who prefer A to B be $N + c$, and therefore the number who prefer B to A be $N - c$. Then it is easy to see that the numbers of votes polled by A, B, C at the first scrutiny will be

$$2N - b + c, 2N - c + a, 2N - a + b$$

respectively. For if the compound symbol AB be used to denote the number of electors who put A first and B second, and similarly for other cases, it is clear that A's score at the first scrutiny will be

$$2AB + 2AC + BA + CA.$$

Now this expression can be written in the form

$$(AB + AC + CA) + (AC + AB + BA),$$

and it is clear that the three terms in the first pair of brackets represent precisely the number of electors who prefer A to B, which number has already been denoted by $N + c$. In the same way the remaining three terms represent the number of electors who prefer A to C, which number has been denoted by $N - b$. Hence the score of A on the first scrutiny is $2N - b + c$. In exactly the same way it may be shown that the scores of B, C are $2N - c + a$ and $2N - a + b$ respectively. The sum of these three numbers is $6N$, as it ought to be. Thus $2N$ is the mean or average of these three numbers, and consequently the highest of the three candidates must have more than $2N$ votes, and the lowest must have less than $2N$ votes. Now, let us suppose that a majority of the electors prefer A to B, and likewise that a majority prefer A to C; then c must be positive, and b must be negative. Hence the score of A, which has been shown to be $2N - b + c$ is necessarily greater than $2N$, for it exceeds $2N$ by the sum of the two positive quantities $-b$ and c . Thus A has more than $2N$ votes, that is, more than one-third, or the average of the votes polled. He cannot, therefore, be rejected at the first scrutiny, so that B or C or both must be rejected at the first scrutiny. If either of the two, B and C, be not rejected, A must win at the second scrutiny, for there is a majority for A against B, and also against C. Hence, then, it has been demonstrated that if the opinions of the electors are such that there is a majority in favour of A as against B, and likewise a majority in favour of A as against C, the method of election which is proposed will certainly bring about the correct result; whereas it has been shown by the consideration of particular examples that the methods in ordinary use may easily bring about an erroneous result under these circumstances. Thus the proposed method cannot bring about a result which is contrary to the wishes of the majority, so that the proposed method satisfies the fundamental condition.

The method which is proposed has, I think, strong claims. It is not at all difficult to carry out. The result will, as often as not, be decided on the first scrutiny. We simply require each elector to put down the names of two of the three candidates in order of preference. Then for each first name two votes are counted, and for each second name one vote is counted. The number of votes for each candidate is then found. The third part of the sum total may be called the average; then all candidates who are not above the average are at once rejected. The lowest candidate must, of course, be below the average. The second is just as likely to be below as above the average. If he is below, the election is settled; but if he is above the average, a second scrutiny is necessary to decide between him and the highest candidate.

CASES OF INCONSISTENCY.

We have now to consider what is the result of the proposed method in those cases in which there is not a majority for one candidate against each of the others. The methods which have been described have been shown to be erroneous by examining cases in which either one candidate has an absolute majority of the electors in his favour, or a candidate A is inferior to B and also to C, or a candidate A is superior to B and also to C. Now it is not necessary that any of these cases should occur. If a single person has to place three candidates in order of preference he can do so, and it would be quite impossible for any rational person to arrive at the conclusions

When, however, we have to deal with a body of men, this result may easily occur, and no one of the candidates can be elected without contradicting some one of the propositions stated above. If this result does occur, then, no matter what result any method of election may give, it cannot be demonstrated to be erroneous.

We have examined several methods, and all but the one now proposed have been shown to lead to erroneous results in certain cases. It may fairly be urged, then, that that method which cannot be shown to be erroneous in any case has a greater claim to our consideration than any of the other methods which can be shown to be erroneous. On this ground alone I think the method proposed ought to be adopted for all cases.

We can, however, give other reasons in favour of the method proposed. We have seen that it gives effect to the views of the majority in all cases except that in which the three results (1), (2), (3) are arrived at. In this case there is no real majority, and we cannot arrive at any result without abandoning some one of the three propositions (1), (2), (3). It seems most reasonable that that one should be abandoned which is affirmed by the smallest majority. Now, if this be conceded, it may be shown that the proposed method will give the correct result in all cases. For it is easily seen that the majorities in favour of the three propositions (1), (2), (3) are respectively $2a$, $2b$, $2c$. Hence, then, in the case under consideration, a , b , c , must be all positive. Let us suppose that a is the smallest of the three. Then we abandon the proposition (1), and consequently C ought to be elected. Now let us see what the proposed method leads to in this case. B's score at the first scrutiny is $2N - c + a$, and this is necessarily less than $2N$, because c is greater than a , and each is positive. Again, C's score is $2N - a + b$, and this is necessarily greater than $2N$, because b is greater than a , and each is positive. Thus B is below the average, and C is above the average. Therefore, at the first scrutiny B goes out and C remains in. If A goes out also, C wins at the first scrutiny. But if A does not go out, C will beat A at the second scrutiny. Thus C wins in either case, and, therefore, the proposed method leads to the result which is obtained by abandoning that one of the propositions (1), (2), (3) which is affirmed by the smallest majority. We have already seen that in the case in which the numbers a , b , c are not all of the same sign, the proposed method leads to the correct result. Hence, then, if it be admitted that when we arrive at the three inconsistent propositions (1), (2), (3) we are to abandon the one which is affirmed by the smallest majority, it follows that the proposed method will give the correct result in all cases.

We have, then, arrived at two results. First, that if the electors affirm any two of the propositions (1), (2), (3) and affirm the contrary of the remaining one, and so affirm three consistent propositions, then the result of the method of election which is here proposed, will be that which is the logical consequence of these propositions, whilst the methods in ordinary use may easily give a different result. Second, that if the electors affirm the three propositions (1), (2), (3) which are inconsistent, then the result of the method proposed is that which is the logical consequence of abandoning that one of the three propositions which is affirmed by the smallest majority.

ANOTHER WAY OF APPLYING PROPOSED METHOD.

The method may be stated in another form, which may sometimes be more convenient. For each first place count one vote; then, if any candidate has an absolute majority, elect him. But if not, count in addition one vote for each second place; then, if the lowest candidate has not got half as many votes as there are electors, reject him, and proceed to a final scrutiny between the remaining two. But, if not, take the aggregate for each candidate of the results of the two counts; then reject all who have less than one-third of the votes now counted, and, if necessary, proceed to a final scrutiny.

This process will give the same final result as the method already described. This is readily seen as follows:—1st. If any one has an absolute majority on the first places, the election is settled at the first scrutiny, and the result is manifestly correct, and therefore the same as that of the proposed method. 2nd. If no one has an absolute majority on the first places, but some one has on first and second places less than half as many votes as there are electors, it is manifest that more than half the electors consider that candidate worse than each of the others, so that he ought to be rejected, and hence the result of the final scrutiny will be correct, and therefore in accordance with that of the proposed method. 3rd. If neither of the above events happen, we take the aggregate. Now (as has already been remarked) the result of taking the aggregate is to give us exactly the same state of the poll as in the first scrutiny of the proposed method. Thus the second way of applying the method will give the same final result as the proposed method. This second way is very convenient, for if there be an absolute majority for or against any candidate, it is made obvious at the first or second count, and the election is settled with as little counting as possible. The two counts are conducted on well known plans, and if the circumstances are such that either of these necessarily gives a correct result, that result is adopted. But if it is not obvious that a correct result can be arrived at, then we take the mean, or what comes to the same thing, the aggregate of the two counts. This might appear to be a rule of thumb, and on that account may perhaps commend itself to some persons. This is not the case, however; and it is remarkable that that which might suggest itself as a suitable compromise in the matter should turn out to be a rigorously exact method of getting at the result in all cases. The view of the proposed method which has just been given shows exactly what modifications require to be

made in Condorcet's practical method in order to make it accurate.

LAPLACE'S OBJECTION.

It may be said that the proposed method is open to the objection raised by Laplace to the method of Borda. To this I think it a sufficient answer to say, that if we have a method which will truly interpret the wishes of the electors, as expressed by their voting papers, we need not trouble ourselves whether they vote honestly or not; that is their own concern. If we provide a method which will bring out a correct result for honest electors we need not try to go further, and endeavour to construct a method which will force dishonest electors to vote honestly. Nevertheless, it may be pointed out that Laplace's objection is not of so much force in this case as in the case of Borda's method. For if an elector vote otherwise than according to his real views it will be at the risk of having his vote at the final scrutiny counted against the candidate whom he considers most fit for the office to be filled. This risk would be sufficient to deter most electors from voting otherwise than according to their real opinions. If, in spite of this risk, an elector persists in voting otherwise than according to his real views we must take him at his word. To illustrate this objection, let us suppose that B and C are two formidable candidates, and that A is in reality inferior to each of them, but that the voting is as follows, $BA = 5$, $CA = 4$, $AB = 1$, $AC = 1$; so that B's supporters, in their anxiety to defeat C, put A second, and C's supporters, in their anxiety to defeat B, put A second. The result at the first scrutiny is A 13 votes, B 11 votes, C 9 votes. Thus C is rejected and A wins in the final scrutiny. A wins because the whole of C's supporters put him second. Had one of C's supporters voted according to his real views, and put B second, the result would have been different.

If the preferential mode of voting were not employed, this objection would be of great force; for then the supporters of each candidate would put his most formidable opponent at the bottom of their list at the first scrutiny, knowing that they would have at the second scrutiny an opportunity of reviewing their vote.

A MODIFICATION OF PROPOSED METHOD.

It may be mentioned that there is another, but in general a more tedious, method of getting at a result, which cannot be shown to be erroneous in any case. This method has been adopted by the Trinity College Dialectic Society. It is as follows:—In the method proposed above, instead of rejecting all the candidates who are not above the average, reject the lowest only. It is obvious from what has been said above that this cannot lead to error. But a second scrutiny will always be required, whereas in the proposed method one scrutiny only may be necessary. There is another disadvantage: the result will not in all cases agree with that of the proposed method. For, let us suppose that a , b , c are all positive, and that a is the least of the three, and at the same time that $2c$ is less than $a + b$. On the method proposed, as we have already seen, C would be elected, but on the method now under discussion B would be elected. For the scores of A and B at the first scrutiny are $2N - b + c$, $2N - c + a$, respectively, and the first of them is the smallest, because $2c$ is less than $a + b$, and therefore $c - b$ is less than $a - c$. Thus A would be thrown out at the first scrutiny, and a second scrutiny would be held to decide between B and C, and B would win because a is positive. Thus the result is that which would follow from abandoning the proposition "A is better than B," which is affirmed by a majority of $2c$, whereas the result of the proposed method is that which would follow from abandoning the proposition "B is better than C," which is affirmed by a majority of $2a$, which is smaller than the former majority.

There is, however, one point in favour of the modified method. The first scrutiny will at once give us the values of the three differences $b - c$, $c - a$, $a - b$. From these, of course, we cannot find a , b , c . In the modified method, however, a second scrutiny is always necessary, and this will at once give us the value of one of the three a , b , c . Having already found the three differences, we can at once find each of the quantities a , b , c , and hence we can ascertain if the result is demonstrably correct. Thus if the modified method be used, we can always ascertain, by a simple calculation, whether the result is perfectly satisfactory or not. The same remark applies to the proposed method in those cases in which two scrutinies are necessary.

ALGEBRAIC ANALYSIS.

Before leaving the case in which there are three candidates only, it may be of interest to give a short algebraical analysis of the question. As before, let the compound symbol AB stand for the number of electors who put A first and B second, and similarly for other cases. Let us suppose, as is clearly possible, that six quantities, a , b , c , a , $\#$, $\#$, are found from the following equations:

$$AB = \# + c \quad BC = \# + a \quad CA = a + b$$

$$AC = \# - b \quad BA = a - c \quad CB = \# - a$$

Also let us suppose that $2N$ denotes the whole number of electors, which is clearly equal to $2(a + \# + \#)$, then the states of the poll on the different modes of election which have been discussed are as shown in the following table:—

Analysis of Votes. Single Vote. Double. Borda. Condorcet. A { $AB = \# + c$ } { $AC = \# - b$ } { $BC = \# + a$ } B { $BA = a - c$ } C { $CA = a + b$ } { $CB = \# - a$ } $\# + \# - b + c$ $\# + a - c + a$ $a + \# - a + b$ $N + a$ $N + \#$ $N + \#$ $2N - b + c$ $2N - c + a$ $2N - a + b$ * $N + a$ $N - a$ * $N - c$ $N - c$ * $2N = 2(a + \# + \#)$ $2N$ $4N$ $6N$ $2N$ $2N$ $2N$

In the first column is set out an analysis of the votes. In the second is the result of the poll on the single vote method. For instance, in the first line we have the quantity $\# + \# - b + c$, which is the sum of AB and AC , *i.e.*, it denotes the number of electors who put A first. In the third column is the result of the poll on the double vote system, in which each elector has two votes. For instance, in the first line we have $N + a$, or what is the same, $2a + \# + \#$, and this is equal to $AB + AC + BA + CA$, *i.e.*, it denotes the number of electors who put A first or second. In the fourth column is the result of the poll on Borda's method. For instance, in the first line we have $2N - b + c$, and this is equal to $2AB + 2AC + BA + CA$, as it ought to be. It is also seen at once that $2N - b + c$ is the sum of the two numbers in the first line in the second and third columns. This shows the truth of what was stated above, *viz.*, that the poll on Borda's method is the aggregate of the polls on the single and double vote systems. In the fifth, sixth, and seventh columns, under the heading Condorcet, are set down the states of the poll on the supposition that each of the candidates, A , B , C , is excluded in turn. Thus, if A be supposed excluded for a moment, we have $N + a$ votes for B in preference to C , and consequently $N - a$ for C in preference to B . For $N + a$ is equal to $AB + BC + BA$, as it ought to be. Thus it is clear that $2a$ is the majority for B as against C , so that the letters a , b , c , have the same meaning as in the previous part of this paper. It is clear too, as has been proved before, that the number in any row in the column headed Borda, is the sum of the two numbers in the same row in the columns headed Condorcet.

The result of the method of election proposed in this paper depends solely upon the numbers a , b , c . The same is true of the method of Borda. On the other hand, the result of the double vote method depends solely on the values of a , $\#$, $\#$. Consequently, whatever be the result of the proposed method or of Borda's method we can clearly construct cases in which the result of the double vote method shall be what we please. The same is true of the single vote method; for although the result of the single vote method depends upon a , b , c as well as upon a , $\#$, $\#$, it is easy to see that we can choose a , $\#$, $\#$ so as to eliminate the effect of the quantities a , b , c , whatever may be the values of the latter. The results of the Venetian method and of Ware's method depend on the values of a , b , c as well as upon those of a , $\#$, $\#$, so that although for given values of a , b , c we cannot bring about any result we please, still we can choose a , $\#$, $\#$ so as to bring about a result different from the true one. This, of course, is to be done by choosing a , $\#$, $\#$, so that the best candidate is thrown out at the first scrutiny. We have already seen that this is possible.

It is clear that no one of the quantities $\# + \#$, $\# + a$, $a + \#$ can be negative. For we have $\# + \# = BC + CB$, and BC , CB can neither of them be negative. Again, $\# + \# = N - a$; thus a cannot be greater than N . So also $\#$, $\#$ can neither of them exceed N . Since $\# + \#$ cannot be negative, $\#$ and $\#$ cannot both be negative; thus one only of the three a , $\#$, $\#$ can be negative. If a be negative it is clear that the numerical value cannot exceed N , for $a + \#$ cannot be negative, and $\#$ cannot exceed N . So for $\#$ and $\#$. Thus no one of the three a , $\#$, $\#$ can numerically exceed N , and one at most can be negative.

The limits between which a , b , c must lie are at once found from the consideration that AB , AC , &c., must none of them be negative. Thus $a + \#$, $\# - a$ can neither of them be negative; thus a cannot be less than $-\#$ nor greater than $\#$. Hence, *a fortiori*, no one of the three a , b , c , can be numerically greater than N . This last result is obvious from the fact that no one of the numbers in the columns headed "Condorcet" can be negative.

Formal demonstrations will now be given of a few results.

(i.) If any candidate have less than N votes on the double vote method, he ought not to be elected.

This has already been seen, but the following proof is given. Suppose A has less than N votes; then a must be negative, and therefore c must be negative and b positive. Thus A is worse than B , and also worse than C .

(ii.) Even if every elector put A in the first or second place it does not follow that A ought to be elected.

For if A has no third places we must have $BC = 0$ and $CB = 0$, thus $a = \# = -\#$. Suppose $\#$ positive and therefore $\#$ negative. Then by preceding case C ought to go out and A or B ought to win as c is positive or negative. Now c may be negative so that B may win; for the only conditions with reference to c are that c must be greater than $-\#$ and less than a , and as $\#$ is positive it is clear that c may be negative.

(iii.) It is impossible to arrive at the true result by merely counting the number of first places, the number of second places, and the number of third places for each candidate.

This result seems obvious enough after what has been given. It may, however, be formally proved as follows.

Let A_1, A_2, A_3 , denote the numbers of first, second, and third places respectively for A, and let corresponding meanings be given to $B_1, \&c., C_1, \&c.$ Then we have

$$A_1 = \# + \# - b + c \quad A_2 = 2a + b - c \quad A_3 = \# + \#$$

with corresponding equations for B's and C's. We see at once from these equations that it is impossible to find a, b, c even if $A_1, A_2, A_3, B_1, \&c.,$ be all given. We can, however, find $a, \#, \#$ and the three differences $b - c, c - a, a - b,$ viz., the results are

$$a = N - A_3, \# = N - B_3, \# = N - C_3$$

$$b - c = A_3 - A_1, c - a = B_3 - B_1, a - b = C_3 - C_1, \text{ where } 2N = A_1 + B_1 + C_1 = A_3 + B_3 + C_3 \dots$$

(i) thus any five of the quantities $A_1, B_1, C_1, A_3, B_3, C_3,$ may be chosen at pleasure; the sixth and N are then determined by the conditions (i) and A_2, B_2, C_2 are then given by the equations

$$A_2 = 2N - A_1 - A_3, \&c.$$

(iv.) If there be a demonstrably correct result, say A better than B and B better than C, so that $c, a,$ are positive and b negative, then if Ware's method be wrong, Venetian method is right, and if Venetian method be wrong, Ware's method is right.

For if Ware be wrong A must be lowest on the single vote method, and therefore we must have

$$a + \# - a + b > \# + \# - b + c \text{ or } a > \# + a + c - 2b$$

i.e., a fortiori $a > \#$ because a, c are positive and b negative. Thus A cannot be lowest on double vote method, so that A will win on the Venetian method. Again, if Venetian be wrong, A must be lowest on double vote method, and therefore we must have $\# > a$ and therefore $\# - \# - b + c > a + \# - a + b$ because a, c are positive and b negative. Thus A cannot be lowest on single vote method, so that A will win on Ware's method.

(v.) If we agree to accept the proposed method as correct in all cases, then the conclusions of the last proposition will be true in all cases.

For, in the demonstration of the last proposition, the essential condition is that $a + c - 2b$ should be positive. Now, if we suppose as before that the accepted result is A better than B, and B better than C, we must have a, b, c all positive and b the smallest of the three, so that it is clear that $a + c - 2b$ is positive.

Comparing then Ware's method with the Venetian method, we see that both may be right, or one wrong and one right, but both cannot be wrong; so that, if these two methods agree, the result cannot be shown to be wrong. If, however, they do not agree, we cannot tell which is right without in effect having recourse to the proposed method.

(vi.) If $a = b = c,$ single and double vote methods give different results.

For A's scores on the two methods will be respectively $N - a$ and $N + a.$ Thus, if $\# > \# > a,$ the candidates are in the order A, B, C on the single vote method, and in the order C, B, A on the double vote method. In this case Borda's method leads to a tie, and consequently the proposed method also. Ware elects A or B as c is positive or negative, and Venetian method elects C or B as a is negative or positive. Thus, in this case, Ware and Venetian method give different results.

(vii.) If $a = \# = \#,$ double vote method, and therefore also Venetian method, gives a tie; single vote method and Borda lead to same result; but Ware and proposed method will not necessarily lead to same result. If one only of the three, $b - c, c - a, a - b,$ be negative, Ware and proposed method will lead to same result; but if two be negative the results may or may not agree.

(viii.) If $AB = AC, BC = BA, CA = CB,$ all the methods will give the same result, and that result will be demonstrably correct.

This is the case in which the strong supporters of each candidate are equally divided as to the merits of the remaining candidates. In this case we have

$$a = \# - \#, b = \# - a, c = a - \#,$$

and A's scores on the single, double, and Borda's method are respectively $2a, N + a, N + 3a.$ Thus, if $a > \# > \#$ it is obvious that each of these methods will put A first, B second, and C third, and it is clear that this result is correct, for a, c are positive and b negative. It is at once seen that all the methods which have been discussed will lead to the same result in this case.

(ix.) If we suppose that

$$a = N/3 + p (b-c), \# = N/3 + P (C-), \# = N/3 + p (a-b),$$

then A's scores on the single, double, and Borda methods will be respectively

$$2N/3 - (p+1)(b-c), 4N/3 + (b-c), 2N - (b-c).$$

Hence we see that

If $p < 0$ and $> -1,$ the results of all three methods will be the same.

If $p = 1,$ double and Borda methods will give the same result, which will be opposite to that of single method.

If $p > 0,$ single and Borda methods will give the same result, which will be opposite to that of double method.

Thus, if $p > 0$ or < -1 , single and double methods will give different results. If we suppose that b, c are positive and a negative, and also that $2b < c + a$, then it may be shown that these different results will both be wrong.

CASES OF MORE THAN THREE CANDIDATES.

It remains now to state and examine the method proposed for the case in which there are more than three candidates.

A series of scrutinies are held on Borda's system of voting, and all candidates who on any scrutiny have not more than the average number of votes polled on that scrutiny are excluded. As many scrutinies are held as may be necessary to exclude all but one of the candidates, and the candidate who remains uneliminated is elected.

The method proposed cannot lead to the rejection of any candidate who is in the opinion of a majority of the electors better than each of the other candidates, nor can it lead to the election of a candidate who is in the opinion of a majority worse than each of the other candidates. These results are an extension of those already proved for the case of three candidates, and they may be proved as follows:—As before, let $2N$ be the number of electors, and let the candidates be denoted by $A, B, C, D, \&c.$ Let the compound symbol ab denote the number of electors who consider A better than B , and let corresponding meanings be given to $ac, ad, ba, \&c.$, so that ba will denote the number of electors who prefer B to A , and we shall, therefore, have $ab + ba = 2N$. Now suppose that at the commencement of any scrutiny the unexcluded candidates are $A, B, C, \dots P$, then the score of A on that scrutiny will be

$$ab + ac + ad + \dots + ap.$$

For suppose that there are n unexcluded candidates, and consider a voting paper on which A now occupies the r th place. For this A gets $n - r$ votes. Now on this paper A stands before $n - r$ other candidates. Thus the $n - r$ votes which A receives may be considered each as due to the fact that A stands before one of the following $n - r$ candidates. Thus we see that on any one voting paper A receives one vote for every candidate placed after him. Summing up for all the voting papers, we see that A receives one vote for each candidate placed after him on each paper. Now ab denotes the number of times B is placed after A on all the papers, and similarly for $ac, ad, \&c.$ Thus it is clear that A 's score is

$$ab + ac + ad + \dots + ap.$$

This result was stated by Borda,

Mémoires de l'Académie Royal des Sciences, 1781, p. 663.

but proved only for the case of three candidates.

The whole number of votes polled is

$$2N(1 + 2 + 3 + 4 \dots + n - 1)$$

or $Nn(n - 1)$. Thus the average polled by all the candidates is $N(n - 1)$. Now let us suppose that there is a majority for A as against each of the other candidates, then each of the $n - 1$ numbers $ab, ac, ad, \dots ap$ is greater than N ; thus the sum of these numbers, which is equal to A 's score, is necessarily greater than $(n - 1)N$, that is, greater than the average score. Thus A will be above the average on every scrutiny, so that he must win on the proposed method.

Next, let us suppose that there is a majority for each of the other candidates against A . Then each of the numbers $ab, ac, \dots ap$ is less than N , and therefore their sum, which is equal to A 's score, is less than $(n - 1)N$, that is, less than the average score. Thus A is below the average, and will, therefore, be excluded at the first scrutiny.

The results which have just been proved are particular cases of a more general theorem, which may be enunciated as follows:—

If the candidates can be divided into two groups, such that each candidate in the first group is, in the opinion of a majority of the electors, better than each of the candidates in the second group, then the proposed method cannot lead to the election of a candidate of the second group.

The results which have just been proved are obtained from the above by supposing, first, that the first group contains one candidate, and the second group all the rest; and second, that the first group contains all but one of the candidates, and the second group the remaining candidate.

Let the first group consist of the l candidates, $A, B, C, \&c.$, and let the second group consist of the m candidates, $P, Q, R, \&c.$, and let $l + m = n$, so that n is the whole number of candidates. Because each of the candidates $A, B, C, \&c.$, is better than each of the candidates $P, Q, R, \&c.$, each of the numbers $ap, aq, ar, \&c. \dots bp, bq, \&c. \dots \&c.$, is greater than N . Now the scores of $A, B, C, D, \&c.$, at the first scrutiny are respectively

$$\begin{aligned} & * ab + ac + ad + \&c.\dots\dots + ap + aq + ar + \&c. \quad ba * + bc + bd + \&c.\dots\dots + bp + bq + br + \&c. \quad ca + cb * + cd \\ & + \&c.\dots\dots + cp + cq + cr + \&c. \quad da + db + dc * + \&c.\dots\dots + dp + dq + dr + \&c. \quad \&c. \quad \&c. \quad \&c. \end{aligned}$$

If we add together all these numbers, we shall get the sum of the scores of A, B, C, D, &c. Now the numbers in the first l columns can be arranged in pairs, such as ab , ba , and $ab + ba = 2N$, and then are $\frac{1}{2} l (l - 1)$, of these pairs; thus, the sum of the first l columns is $Nl(l - 1)$. Again, the numbers in the last m columns are each greater than N , and there are lm of these numbers; thus, the sum of the last m columns is greater than Nlm . Thus, the sum of all the numbers is greater than $Nl(l - 1) + Nlm$; that is, than $Nl(l + m - 1)$; that is, greater than $Nl(n - 1)$. Thus the sum of the scores of the l candidates of the first group is greater than $Nl(n - 1)$. Hence the average score of the candidates of the first group is greater than $N(n - 1)$. Hence the candidates of the first group cannot all be rejected at the first scrutiny. By the same reasoning it follows that those of the first group who survive cannot all be rejected at the second scrutiny; and so on. Thus some candidate of the first group must win on the proposed method; or, in other words, no candidate of the second group can be elected.

If the candidates can be divided into two groups in the manner just indicated, it is quite clear that no candidate of the second group ought to win. At the same time, whichever of the candidates of the first group wins, the result cannot be shown to be erroneous. If the division into groups can be made in more than one way it is clear that the last statement applies only to the smallest group of the first kind. Now in the proposed method the successful candidate must belong to the smallest group of the first kind. Hence then it is clear that the result of the proposed method cannot be shown to be erroneous in any case.

It is clear that no candidate can have more than $N(2n - 2)$ votes on any scrutiny, n being as before the number of unexcluded candidates at the commencement of that scrutiny. For a candidate could only have this number by obtaining the first place on each voting paper.

Again, if any candidate obtain $N(2n - 3)$ votes on any scrutiny, there is an absolute majority in his favour, so that we can at once elect him. For if a candidate were not put first on half the papers, he could not have so many as $(n - 1)N + (n - 2)N$ votes, this being the number he would have if he were put first on one half of the papers and second on the other half. It is clear, too, that if any candidate has less than N votes there is an absolute majority against him; for if a candidate has less than N votes, he must be last on at least half of the papers. These results are not of much use except in the case of three candidates; for if there be more than three candidates, it is only in cases of remarkable unanimity that a candidate can have so many as $N(2n - 3)$, or so few as N votes. If, however, there be three candidates only, the above results may be stated as follows:—The average is $2N$; the largest number of votes any one candidate can have is $4N$; if any candidate has $3N$ votes, or more, there is an absolute majority for him, and we can elect him at once, no matter whether the second candidate is above the average or not; if any candidate has less than N votes, there is an absolute majority against him, so that the result of the proposed method is demonstrably correct.

In the case of any number of candidates it will sometimes save a great deal of trouble if we first examine if there be an absolute majority for or against any candidate. This is easily done, and the results arrived at in the inquiry will be of use in carrying out the proposed method, if such be found necessary. For let $A_1, A_2 \dots A_n$, denote the numbers of papers on which A occupies the first, the second ... the last or n th place, and let similar meanings be given to $B_1, B_2, \&c., C_1, \&c.$ If A_1 be greater than N , there is an absolute majority for A, and we may at once elect him. If A_n be greater than N , there is an absolute majority against A, and we may at once exclude him. If neither of these results hold good for any candidate, we must use the proposed method in its general form. Now A's score on that method is

$$(n-1)A_1 + (n-2)A_2 + \dots + (n-r)A_r + \dots + A_{n-1}.$$

Thus to find A's score we must find $A_2, A_3 \dots A_{n-1}$. Now to find these it is not necessary to count all the votes for A. For we have

$$A_1 + A_2 + A_3 + \dots + A_n = 2N,$$

and A_1, A_3 having been already found, we see that it is sufficient to calculate any $n - 3$ of the $n - 2$ quantities, $A_2, A_3 \dots A_{n-1}$, and the remaining one can then be found from the above equation.

It would, however, in practice be better to calculate each of the n quantities, $A_1, A_2 \dots A_n$, and then to use the above equation as a test of the accuracy of the counting of the votes. Similar remarks apply to the numbers $B_1, B_2 \dots B_n, c_1, c_2 \dots c_n, \&c.$

We have also n equations of the former

$$Ar + Br + Cr + \dots = 2N$$

where r may have any one of the values $1, 2, 3 \dots n$. This gives us n independent tests of the accuracy of the enumeration of the votes. In fact, if we arrange the n^2 quantities, $A_1, A_2 \dots A_n, B_1 \&c.,$ in the form of a square array

$$A_1, A_2, A_3, \&c. B_1, B_2, B_3, \&c. C_1, C_2, C_3, \&c. \&c., \&c., \&c.$$

the sum of every row and of every column ought to be $2N$, so that we have altogether $2n - 1$ independent tests of the accuracy of the enumeration of the votes.

The proposed method is not so laborious as might appear at first sight. The number of scrutinies will not usually be large; for we may reasonably expect to halve the number of candidates at each scrutiny. At each

scrutiny we reject all who are not above the average. Now in the long run we may expect to find as many below as above the average on a poll. Thus, if there be eight candidates we should not, on the average, require more than three scrutinies. There can be no doubt, however, that the method would be tedious if the number of electors were very large, unless the number of candidates was very small indeed. In cases where the number of electors is large Ware's method has great practical advantages; for in that method we only require to count one vote for each paper examined at each scrutiny, and at every scrutiny except the first the number of papers to be examined is but a small fraction of the whole number of papers.

CONDORCET'S THEORETICAL METHOD.

A method of election was described by Condorcet in 1785, but on account of its complexity it was never proposed for actual use. On this account, and in order to distinguish it from Condorcet's practical method (which has been already described), I propose to call it Condorcet's theoretical method. This method is described by its author in the following terms:—

"There exists but one rigorous method of ascertaining the wish of the majority in an election. It consists in taking a vote on the respective merits of all the candidates compared two and two. This can be deduced from the lists upon which each elector has written their names in order of merit."

"But, in the first place, this method is very long. If there are only twenty candidates, in order to compare them two and two we must examine the votes given upon one hundred and ninety propositions, and upon seven hundred and eighty propositions if there are forty candidates. Often, indeed, the result will not be as satisfactory as we could wish, for it may happen that no candidate may be declared by the majority to be superior to all the others; and then we are obliged to prefer the one who is alone judged superior to a larger number; and amongst those who are judged superior to an equal number of candidates, the one who is either judged superior by a greater majority or inferior by a smaller. But cases present themselves where this preference is difficult to determine. The general rules are complicated and embarrassing in application." (*Œuvres de Condorcet*, vol. xv., pp. 28, 29.)

By this method Condorcet showed that the single vote method and the methods of Ware and Borda are erroneous. I do not think however, that any one has hitherto noticed that Borda's method may lead to the rejection of a candidate who has an absolute majority of the electors in his favour as against all comers. It has also been shown above by the help of this theoretical method that Condorcet's practical method is erroneous. Thus it will be seen that the theoretical method is of use in testing the accuracy of other methods. From the description which has been given above, however, it is not clear what the result of the theoretical method is, even in the simplest cases, when discordant propositions are affirmed, for if there be three candidates only, and with the notation already used, we have $a = 1$, $b = 2$, $c = 3$, each candidate is superior to one other candidate, and A is superior by most, whilst C is inferior by least. Thus, according to the above description, it is not certain which of the two, A or C, wins. In another passage, however,

Œuvres, vol. xiii., p. 259.

Condorcet explains how he deals with any case of three candidates, and the process he adopts in the case of inconsistent propositions is to reject the one affirmed by the smallest majority. This is exactly the process which has been described above, and which was shown to be in accordance with the method proposed. Thus it is clear that in the case of three candidates the result of the proposed method will always be the same as that of Condorcet's theoretical method.

The general rules for the case of any number of candidates as given by Condorcet

Essai sur l'application de l'analyse à la probabilité des décisions rendues à la pluralité des voix, pp. 125, 126.

are stated so briefly as to be hardly intelligible. Moreover, it is not easy to reconcile these rules with the statements made in the passage quoted above, and as no examples are given it is quite hopeless to find out what Condorcet meant.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSED METHOD WITH CONDORCET'S THEORETICAL METHOD.

Comparing the method proposed in this paper with Condorcet's theoretical method, we see that, so far as any conclusion can be drawn from the votes of the electors the two methods always agree. In those cases in which no conclusion can be drawn from the votes the results of the two methods will not always be the same. It

is equally impossible to prove either of these results wrong. Condorcet's method always shows whether the result is incapable of being proved wrong or not, but the proposed method gives us no information on this point. With the proposed method, however, there is no difficulty in arriving at the result in any case, whereas Condorcet's method is, by his own admission, so complicated as to be quite impracticable. Condorcet returns the candidate who is superior to the largest number of other candidates, without reference either to the numbers of votes by which the candidate is superior to those other candidates, or to the number of votes by which the candidate is inferior to the remaining candidates. Now in the proposed method both these elements are taken into consideration. Each candidate is, in fact, credited with the numbers of votes by which he beats all candidates he is superior to, and is debited with the numbers of votes by which he is beaten by all candidates he is inferior to. All candidates who have the balance against them are excluded, and the election then proceeds as if the remaining candidates were the only ones eligible.

It seems clear, then, that the proposed method is quite as rigorous as that of Condorcet. It gives the same result as Condorcet's in the case of three candidates, and it agrees therewith in all cases so far as any conclusion can be drawn from the votes. In those cases in which no valid conclusion can be drawn from the votes the two methods may not agree, and although nothing can be proved one way or another in these cases, the principles on which the proposed method is founded seem quite as sound as those of Condorcet's method. The proposed method has, however, great practical advantages over Condorcet's method, for the process of arriving at the result is the same in all cases; the operations throughout are of the same kind. The number of numerical results which have to be arrived at is much smaller than in Condorcet's method. For instance, if there be sixteen candidates we should expect, in the long run, to have four scrutinies, involving thirty numerical results, whereas Condorcet's method would require the computation of the votes for and against one hundred and twenty different propositions. When the numerical results are arrived at there is not the slightest difficulty in applying them, whereas in Condorcet's method the rules are very complicated. It may be claimed, then, that the proposed method has all the rigour of Condorcet's method and none of its practical difficulties.

INCOMPLETE VOTING PAPERS.

There is a point of some practical importance to be considered in connection with the proposed method. If the number of candidates was large, some of the electors might not be able to make out a complete list of the candidates in order of preference. We have then to consider how voting papers, on which the names are not all marked in order of preference, are to be dealt with. Such a voting paper may be called incomplete. In order to examine this question, let us first suppose, for the sake of simplicity, that there are only three candidates A, B, C, and that the votes tendered are of one of the forms AB, BA, C, that is to say, that all the electors who put A first put B second, that all who put B first put A second, and that all who vote for C mark no second name. In accordance with the proposed method, for each paper of the form AB, two votes would be given to A and one to B; and for each paper of the form BA, two votes would be given to B and one to A. The question arises, however: is a paper of the form C, that is, a plumper for C, to be counted as one vote or as two votes for C? If it be counted as one vote only, it is clear that C might be defeated even if he had an absolute majority of first votes in his favour. For if we suppose $AB=BA=a$, and $C=c$, it is clear that the scores of A and B will each be equal to $3a$, and that of C to c . Thus C will be defeated unless $c > 3a$; but if $c > 2a$, there is an absolute majority for C. Hence, then, we may be led into error if each plumper for C be counted as one vote only. If, on the other hand, a plumper be counted as two votes, it is clear that C might win even if there were an absolute majority against him. For the score of C will now be $2c$, and C will win if $2c > 3a$. But if $2c < 4a$, there is an absolute majority against C. Thus we should also be led into error if each plumper be counted as two votes. If, however, we agree to count a plumper as three halves of a vote, neither of these errors could occur. This course is readily seen to be the proper one in any case of three candidates, for it clearly amounts to assuming that the electors who plump for C are equally divided as to the merits of A and B. For if a_1 , b_1 , c_1 denote the numbers of plumpers for A, B, C respectively, and if we agree to consider all the electors who plump for A as being equally divided as to the merits of B and C, the effect of the a_1 plumpers for A would be to give $2a_1$ votes to A, and $\frac{1}{2}a_1$ each to B and C. Now, as we are only concerned with the differences of the totals polled for each candidate, we see that the result of the first scrutiny will be the same if we take away $\frac{1}{2}a_1$ votes from each candidate. Thus the result will come out the same if we give $\frac{3}{4}a_1$ votes to A, and none to B or C, so far as the plumpers are concerned. Similarly the result will not be altered if the b_1 plumpers for B be counted, as $\frac{3}{2}b_1$ votes for B and nothing for G and A, and so for C's plumpers. Thus the final result will be in accordance with the views of the electors, if each plumper be reckoned as three halves of a vote.

The assumption that the electors who plump for A are equally divided as to the merits of B and C, appears to be perfectly legitimate, for the electors have an opportunity of stating their preference, if they have one, and

as they have, in the case supposed, declined to express any, it may be fairly concluded that they have none.

At the final scrutiny (if held), all plumpers for the candidate who has been rejected will have no effect.

If there be more than three candidates, and incomplete papers are presented, we should have to make a similar assumption, viz., that in all cases where the preference is not fully expressed, the elector has no preference as regards the candidates whom he has omitted to mark on his voting paper. Thus, for example, if there be four candidates, A, B, C, D, a plumper for A ought to count as two votes for A and none for B, C, D. Again, a voting paper on which A is marked first and B second, and on which no other names are marked, ought to count as two and a half votes for A and three halves of a vote for B. If there be more than four candidates the varieties of incomplete papers would be more numerous, and the weights to be allotted to each would be given by more complicated rules. Practically it would be best to count one vote for each plumper in the case in which only one candidate is marked on a voting paper; one for the last, and two for the first, when two names only are marked on a voting paper; one for the last, two for the next, and three for the first, when three names only are marked on a voting paper, and so on, giving in all cases one vote to the candidate marked lowest on any paper, and as many votes to the candidate marked first as there are names marked on the paper. By this means the rules for computing the votes would be the same in all cases and at all scrutinies. We have seen, it is true, that this method may lead to error. The error has the effect of decreasing the votes for the candidates who are marked on any incomplete paper, and it arises solely in consequence of the papers being incomplete. Thus, if the electors do not fully express their preference, the effect is to injure the chances of their favourite candidates. If, then, we adopt the plan just described for incomplete papers, it will be sufficiently simple for practical purposes, and its use will tend to elicit from electors a full statement of their various preferences.

CASES OF EQUALITY.

No case of equality can occur in the proposed method except when all the candidates poll exactly the same number of votes on a scrutiny, for if less than the whole number of candidates have the same number of votes in any scrutiny, if that common number be not greater than the average, all the equal candidates are excluded. If it be greater, no one of them is excluded; and in either case we pass on to another scrutiny.

If on any scrutiny all the candidates poll exactly the same number of votes, that number, of course, must be the average, and it is necessary that some one should have a casting vote. If it is thought proper to do so, one casting vote can then be made to settle the election, by allowing the casting vote to decide who is to win. But if it is thought that this is giving too much weight to the casting vote, then we may permit the casting vote to decide who is to be excluded, and then proceed to a fresh scrutiny between the remaining candidates. It will be observed, however, that the chance of a casting vote being required at any scrutiny except the last, when only two candidates remain, is very minute, seeing that it depends upon all the candidates polling exactly the same number of votes on a scrutiny.

STATEMENT OF METHOD.

It is convenient to give here a formal statement of the method which it is proposed should be used when incomplete papers are presented.

Each elector is furnished with a list of the candidates in alphabetical order, upon which he indicates his preference amongst the candidates by placing the figure one opposite the name of the candidate of his first choice, the figure two opposite the name of the next in order of preference, the figure three opposite the next, and so on, to as many names as he pleases.

It is, of course, unnecessary to mark all the names; it is sufficient to mark all but one. In what follows, if all the names be marked, it is unnecessary to pay any attention to the name marked lowest in order of preference.

The mode of dealing with the papers is as follows:—For the lowest candidate marked on any paper count one vote, for the next lowest two votes, for the next three votes, and so on, till the highest is reached, who is to receive as many votes as there are names marked on the paper. The total number of votes for each candidate is then to be ascertained; and thence the average number polled. All candidates who have not polled above the average are then to be excluded. If more than one candidate be above the average, then another scrutiny must be held as between all such candidates.

In counting up the votes for the second, or any subsequent scrutiny, no attention must be paid to the names of any candidates who have been excluded.

As many scrutinies as may be necessary must be held, so that finally all the candidates but one are

excluded, and the last remaining candidate is elected.

PRACTICAL DETAILS.

In order to show precisely the amount of labour which would be required to carry out the proposed method, it may be as well to state what appears to be the most convenient way of making up the result. As in the ordinary methods, it would be necessary to have a poll-book in which to keep a tally of the votes. In this book the names of the candidates should be printed from the same type as the ballot papers are printed from. Each ballot paper should be placed with the names in a line with the corresponding names in the poll book, and the numbers written opposite to the names on each ballot paper should then be copied into the successive columns of the poll-book. In this way the risk of error in transcription would be exceedingly small, and any error which was made would be at once detected on placing the ballot paper side by side with the column in which its numbers are recorded. When this is done many of the columns would contain vacant spaces. In every vacant space in each column write a number greater by unity than the largest number copied from the voting paper into that column. After doing this add up the figures in each row; then find the mean or average of the sums. Every candidate who has a sum *equal* to or *greater* than the average is to be excluded. A little consideration will show that this process will give the same result as the method described above. When the papers have once been copied into the poll-book as just described, all subsequent scrutinies that may be necessary can be conducted without handling the voting papers again.

CASES OF BRACKETING.

Under the head of "Incomplete Voting Papers" we have considered a case in which an elector does not fully express his preference. There is, however, another way in which an elector may fail to fully express his preference. An elector may have no difficulty in putting a number of candidates at the bottom of his list, and yet he may have considerable difficulty in deciding as to the precise order in which to place the candidates at the top end of his list. In such a case an elector might wish to put two or more candidates equal for the first, second, or some other place on his list. This may be called a case of bracketing. It is now to be shown that this system of bracketing can be permitted without causing any difficulty in the practical working of the system. Let us suppose that an elector brackets m_1 candidates for the first place, m_2 for the second place, and so on; so that $m_1 + m_2 + m_3 + \dots = n$, the case in which one candidate only is put in the r th place being provided for by supposing $m_r = 1$. Then in the poll-book already described enter the number one for each of the m_1 candidates in the first bracket, the number two for each of the m_2 candidates in the second bracket, the number three for each of the m_3 candidates in third bracket, and so on. Suppose, for example, that there are seven candidates, A, B, C, D, E, P, G, and that an elector wishes to bracket B, E for the first place and A, D, F for the second place, and that he does not care to say anything about C, G. Then he would mark his paper as shown in the margin. As nothing is said about C, G, we should consider them as bracketed for the third or last place. Now in order to record this vote in the poll-book it is merely necessary, as before, to copy the column of numbers on the voting paper into a column of the poll-book, taking care to write in two 3's in the two blank spaces opposite the names C, G. After copying the numbers from each ballot-paper into the poll-book and filling up all the vacant spaces, we should add up the different rows and proceed exactly as before to ascertain the result of the election. Thus it is clear that the method of dealing with the papers is exactly the same no matter how many or how few names be marked, nor how many are bracketed in the various brackets, and that there is very little risk of error in the process.

2A 1B C 2D 1E 2F G

If this system of bracketing be permitted we at once get rid of the objection that the proposed method could only be used in a highly educated constituency, because it is only highly educated electors who can possibly arrange the candidates in order of merit. The method can easily be used by the most ill-informed electors. In fact, an elector, if he so pleased, could vote in exactly the same manner as in elections under the common "majority" system of voting in cases where there are several candidates—that is, the elector may simply cross out the names of all the candidates he objects to and leave uncanceled *as* many names as he pleases. In such a case the uncanceled names would all be considered bracketed for the first place, and the canceled ones as bracketed for the second or last place.

Exactly as in the case of incomplete papers previously discussed, it is easy to see that the method just given is not strictly accurate, that the strictly accurate method would be too complicated for practical purposes, and that the error has the effect of decreasing the chances of success of the favourite candidates of the elector who

resorts to bracketing. In fact it may be shown that the numbers which ought strictly to be entered in the poll-book for the candidates in the successive brackets are

$0, m\frac{1}{2}+m\frac{2}{2}, m\frac{1}{2}+m\frac{2}{2} + m\frac{3}{2}, \dots (1) m\frac{1}{2} + m\frac{2}{2} + m\frac{3}{2} + \dots + m_{r-1} + m_r/2, \&c.$

Now the plan just described comes to the same thing in the end as entering instead of these the numbers $0, 1, 2, \dots (r-1), \&c. (2)$

and as no one of the numbers $m_1, m_2, m_3, \&c.$ can be less than unity, it is easy to see that no one of the numbers (2) can be greater than the corresponding one of the numbers (1) that when no bracketing occurs the two sets (1), (2), are the same, and that the two sets agree until the first bracket is reached. Now observe that the numbers entered in the poll-book are in reality negative votes, and we see at once that the moment an elector begins to bracket, he diminishes the influence of his own vote on the result of the election, and also decreases the chances of success of all candidates who on his own list are placed higher than the bracket. Each additional bracket will have precisely the same effects. Thus it is clear that the effect of the proposed method will be to discourage the practice of bracketing. If we do not wish to discourage this practice we must resort to the accurate method, and use the numbers (1) instead of (2). This is not very difficult to do, but as it introduces a new method for the bracketed votes, it would give considerable extra trouble to the officers who make up the poll-books. The most convenient way of stating the accurate method would be as follows:—For each first place count one negative vote, for each second place count in addition $\frac{1}{2} (m_1 + m_2)$ negative votes, for each third place count in addition to the last $\frac{1}{2} (m_2 + m_3)$ negative votes, for each fourth place count in addition to the last $\frac{1}{2} (m_3 + m_4)$ negative votes, and so on. As before remarked, the numbers for the successive places would be the natural numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, &c, until a bracket was arrived at. When brackets do occur we shall in general have to deal with half-votes, but no smaller fraction could occur.

ANOTHER METHOD FOR CASES OF BRACKETING.

Another plan might also be adopted for dealing with cases of bracketing. It is as follows. For each candidate in the first place count one vote; for each candidate in the second place count $m_1 + 1$ votes; for each candidate in the third place count $m_1 + m_2 + 1$ votes; for each candidate in the fourth place count $m_1 + m_2 + m_3 + 1$ votes; and so on. The plan now under consideration comes to the same thing as counting for the successive places the numbers $0, m_1, m_1 + m_2, \dots m_1 + m_2 + \dots + m_{r-1}, \&c.$ instead of the proper numbers (1). Thus the errors for the successive places are

$0, m_1 - m_2/2, m_1 - m_3/2, \dots m_1 - m_r/2, \&c.$

Hence we see that

- If the same number of candidates be bracketed for each place, the plan is accurate.
- If m_1 be greater than each of the numbers $m_2, m_3, \&c.$, that is, if more candidates are bracketed for the first place than for any other place—then the errors will be all positive, and the effect will be to give the elector more negative votes than he is entitled to, and, consequently, to increase unduly the chances of the candidates bracketed for the first place.
- If m_1 be less than each of the numbers $m_2, m_3, \&c.$ —that is, if fewer candidates are bracketed for the first place than for any other place — then the errors will be all negative, and the effect will be to give the elector fewer negative votes than he is entitled to, and, consequently, to decrease unduly the chances of the candidates placed at the top end of the elector's list.
- If m_1 be equal to the mean of the numbers $m_2, m_3, \&c.$, the elector will have just as many votes as he ought to have, but he will give more negative votes to some candidates and less to others than they ought to have.
- If m_1 be not equal to the mean, then the elector will have more or less votes than he is entitled to, according as m_1 is Greater or less than the mean.

The results just given apply to each scrutiny; but the numbers $m_1, m_2, m_3, \&c.$ will generally be altered at each scrutiny. Thus it is in general impossible to tell at the commencement of an election what will be the effect of different modes of bracketing. Sometimes the elector will get too many votes, sometimes too few. At some scrutinies the candidates at the top end of his list will get too many votes, and at others those at the lower end will get too many votes.

If there be one candidate only in each place except the last, or, in other words, if the only bracket be for the last place, we have the case of incomplete papers discussed above. In this case the plan just described, and the method adopted above, agree; and the effect is, as has already been pointed out, to give the elector too few votes; and this would be the case at each scrutiny, until all but one of the candidates in the bracket are rejected.

If, however, an elector bracket a number of candidates for the first place and arrange all the rest in order of merit, he would get more votes than he is really entitled to, and this would be the case at each scrutiny until all

but one of the candidates in the bracket are rejected. Electors would very soon find this out. Each elector would ask himself the question, How must I vote in order to get as much electoral power as possible; and the answer would very soon be seen to be—I must bracket all the candidates I don't object to for the first place, and I must arrange all the rest in numerical order. Thus, instead of encouraging the electors to arrange all the candidates in order of merit, this plan would lead to each elector trying all he could to defeat objectionable candidates without expressing any opinion as to the relative merits of those he does not object to.

RULE FOR FORFEIT.

If the method which is proposed were adopted for parliamentary elections, it is clear that the number of candidates would be very much greater than at present. In order to prevent the number becoming so great as to make the election unmanageable, it is necessary to provide some method for keeping the number of candidates within reasonable bounds. Such a provision exists for the method now in use. It is that any candidate who fails to obtain one-fifth of the number of votes polled by the lowest successful candidate forfeits the deposit which he has lodged with the returning-officer. This rule is, of course, purely empirical, and we must fix upon some rule of the same kind for the proposed method. I will first state a rule for the method as first described—*i.e.*, when positive votes are used. This rule is as follows:—

If at the first scrutiny any candidate has a number of votes which is less than half the number of votes polled by the candidate who is highest at the first scrutiny, he shall forfeit his deposit.

In the mode of applying the method which is most convenient in practice this rule takes a somewhat more complicated form, as follows:—

If at the first scrutiny any candidate has a number of votes which, together with a number which is equal to half the number of electors, exceeds half the number of votes polled by the candidate who has the smallest number of votes by the average for the first scrutiny, he shall forfeit his deposit.

CASE OF SEVERAL VACANCIES.

Hitherto we have supposed that there is only one vacancy to be filled. If there be more than one vacancy we have to settle a most important question before we can consider what method of election is to be adopted. This question is as follows:—Is the majority of the electors to fill the whole of the vacancies, or are the successful candidates supposed to represent the different sections of the electoral body? The first case is that of the selection by a board of governors or officers to fill various offices. No question of representation is involved, but simply the selection of those persons most fit, in the opinion of the whole electoral body, to fill the different offices. The second case is that of the selection of representatives by a large electoral body. In the first case the "whole electoral body has to decide for itself once for all, and the majority must rule. In the second case the electoral body has to select representatives, who are to decide and act for it in a variety of matters; and in order that the decision may be as far as possible in accordance with the views of the electoral body, it is necessary that all the different sections thereof should, as far as possible, be represented.

In the first case there is only one method of arriving at the correct result, and the method is to fill each vacancy separately. Thus one person must be elected by the method described above; then by means of the same set of voting papers we must proceed to a second election for the next vacancy, and so on till all the vacancies are filled. After each vacancy is filled we must of course suppose the name of the successful candidate erased from all the voting papers.

The second case—that of the selection of representatives—has been considered by Hare, Andræ, and other writers. It is not proposed here to discuss this question beyond pointing out that it follows from the principles which have been established in this paper that the process of "elimination" which has been adopted by all the exponents of Hare's system is not satisfactory.

Mason, Firth & M'Cutcheon, Printers, Melbourne.

The Dumfries Demonstration.

MR. W. McDowall, secretary of the Dumfries Burns Statue Committee, and Editor of the Dumfries *Standard*, and also author of an excellent history of Dumfriesshire, has devoted twenty-one columns of his newspaper to an exhaustive report of the grand demonstration of the 6th of April. His ten years of labour in the matter of the memorial statue are now crowned with success. The idea, however, was not practically taken up

until 1877. Mr McDowall rightly claims credit both for himself and the *Standard* for having been identified with the Burns Statue movement as its originator, and as its devoted and solitary advocate in the Press. The *Standard* is a liberal organ of opinion, and has been instrumental in breaking down the vast feudal powers of the Lord Duke of Drumlanrig and Buccleuch. The Editor's contention has all along been that the peasant poet "deserved a statue at the hands of the Dumfriessians, even from a money point of view. The attractive charm cast over the burgh and its vicinity by his presence and his poetry was worthy of being taken into account." This is peculiarly a Scottish argument. The photographic artist who subscribed to the fund was a perfect type of modern utilitarianism. "Here are my five guineas for Burns Statue. Burns draws hundreds of strangers to Dumfries every season who are my best customers, and it well becomes me to give my mite in aid of your movement."

This is the *argumentum ad ventrem* with a real vengeance. Why, the day of inauguration repaid Dumfries all its money: for we read that "during the day 4000 excursionists entered the town by the Glasgow and South Western Railway, and 1200 by the Caledonian. These numbers, of course, convey no idea of the immense multitudes which thronged our streets, most of whom had come from the town itself and the surrounding country." Dumfries has a population of 21,000 souls. Altogether the Queen of the South must have had, on the 6th of April, an enormous assemblage of about 50,000 souls within her picturesque hills and gates in the lovely vale of Kith. But the worldly-minded editor takes up a higher argument than utilitarianism. He contends more nobly that "the halo of genius cannot be valued in money, neither can it be purchased by the wealth of Cræsus, yet it was poured over Dumfries by the poet during his sojourn, and its lustre remains to it for an abiding heritage, which, could it possibly be taken away, would leave the town poor indeed. We pity the individual who is so utterly sordid, prosaic, or obtuse as not to be able to see that even the common things of the locality, when written about by Burns, became thenceforth objects of special interest, and that those which history had made famous, or nature adorned, acquired a fresh spell of interest or beauty by becoming embalmed in his immortal verse. As regards powers of personal impressment, Burns in his lifetime had few equals; in the way of giving a moral or sentimental value to the subjects of his muse, or the resting-places of his pilgrimage, he is without a rival. Dumfries has been enriched beyond calculation, and above every other town, by Burns becoming one of its adopted sons, by its being the birth-place of many of his best effusions, by having been sometimes his inspirer as well as theme, and in virtue of possessing the shrine which contains his sleeping dust."

The worldly argument, we suspect, had far the greater influence in rearing "the fine marble effigy of Burns" in the picturesque town of Dumfries. Henceforth, however, it will "speak its own eloquent language to the hosts of strangers who will come every year to that favoured spot of the land of Burns." On the 6th of April, in presence of 50,000 souls, "the covering fell from the Statue, amid the loud cheers of the spectators. A party of young ladies strewed the pedestal with flowers." Burns died eighty-six years ago. A few days before his death he made this prediction—"I will be more thought of a hundred years hence than I am to-day." His prophecy has been sooner realised than he anticipated. Why, sixty-seven years ago "the nation at large erected a monument to Burns—the proud mausoleum which canopies his remains." And now a new generation of men rise up and call him blessed, and by way of their appreciation of his matchless genius they erect statues to his memory in Dumfries, Kilmarnock, Dundee, New York, and monuments at Ayr, by the Doon, and in Edinburgh. Dunedin also will have a statue erected in his honour. Montrose, we are informed, is going to erect a statue to Burns. When Dunedin shall have unveiled her statue, then, as I predicted years ago when I broached the idea of a statue here, Melbourne and Sydney will follow suit, and each of those cities shall erect a statue to Burns. The vulgar and the purse-proud will say that this is idolatry. Well, be it so; the idolatry of genius is, at least, more ennobling than that of mere wealth and a spurious social position. We are not surprised to read that the Dumfries movement towards a statue for Burns "did not receive so much support as we looked for from the working classes, though Burns was one of their best friends, and sang the dignity of labour and of man as man, irrespective of earthly rank, as no one did before or has done since." The man who leans upon the working classes leans upon a very brittle reed indeed. With few honourable exceptions, "the nobility and gentry gave the scheme little encouragement. Upon the middle classes of the town it has had mainly to rely; and had they not supported it sturdily, though somewhat slowly and tardily, its course would have been unceasingly difficult." Dumfries is said to be the most picturesque town in Scotland. It is surrounded with hills, and situated in the midst of gardens and orchards. The Nith flows through it, and it is the seat of the tweed and hosiery factories, and of great cattle markets. The railway station is embedded in flower gardens. The good old town was, on the 6th of April, richly decorated and splendidly illuminated. The procession—composed of different trades and organised bodies—numbered fourteen hundred persons. Some plied their different callings in their vehicles as they marched along. The printers "threw off along the route numerous copies of a broadsheet, on which was printed a poem on the unveiling of the statue." Flags, devices, mottoes, and all sorts of artistic emblasonries adorned the various and varied orders of craftsmen. When the statue was unveiled, Lord Roseberry shouted out—"There is the image of the man who once stood shunned in your streets, to stand there for ever as the glory

of your burgh. The respectables who shunned him have disappeared; his troubles, his sorrows, his faults, his failings have vanished. The troubles of his life are no more; the clouds that surrounded his death-bed have disappeared. But his memory, his triumph, and his tomb abide with you for ever." Where are the great men of the eighteenth century now? The Ayrshire peasant is remembered affectionately and honoured greatly, while "the most brilliant society that Edinburgh ever produced" are forgotten. Burns—the ploughman and exciseman—is idolised all the world over, while the Prime Minister of his day, Pitt, is almost forgotten. "The little Pitt and the little Burns set out into the world at the same time. The one was destined to be Prime Minister of Great Britain, the other was destined to be a peasant all his life. One lived on the solitary summit of power, the other on the lonely eminence of genius. Both died harassed with debt; both died with the reputation of lives shortened by excess; both died of a broken heart. The one led a gigantic life, warred and struggled with giants, was a name of terror throughout the world; the other was hardly known outside his little country. But posterity has redressed the balance. The Pitt clubs are dissolved, the Pitt banquets are over, the Pitt anniversaries are no more observed. But there is no quarter of the globe, and not a year that passes, in which the memory of the Ayrshire peasant is not honoured." So spake Lord Roseberry as he was going "to unveil to the free air of heaven the effigy" of Robert Burns. His Lordship justly told his audience there was "no need of any memorial of Burns. The years he spent here, his bones which repose here, are sufficient memorials of that immortal man. While your town exists it is his shrine, and his reputation is part of the very air you breathe. Burns was emphatically a man. He had as his mainspring of action, a love and a sympathy with suffering mankind—it is for this that his memory is to us as the memory of a dead brother, and it is because of this tumult and simplicity and passion of life, as flung into immortal verse, that we love his poetry as much as we admire him. Loving much, he is loved, and it is love which inspires his verse. From his simple poem to Nelly Kirkpatrick, who worked with him in the fields, which he composed in an enthusiasm of passion, down to the last touching words that he expressed on his death-bed, "O, wert thou in the cauld blast?" every word that he wrote was inspired by love of his kind. Nor was his love limited only to humanity. He sings of his horse, he sings of his dog, he sings of the poor mouse that his plough turns up in the field. Nothing in the world is alien to him except pomp, or fraud, or oppression. He cherishes all the simple inhabitants of a world too hard for them, as it was for him. It is for this that his poetry is so universally believed; it is for this that his sympathies reach beyond the grave; and because of this every toiler in the world may claim a share in the poems of Burns." In short, my lord, you mean to say, in one word, that Burns was a man of the people. Professor Wilson said "that Burns was the greatest poet that ever sprung from the bosom of the people." This was evidenced by the demonstration of the 6th of April. Mr James McKie, Kilmarnock, the well-known publisher of Burns' works, characterised the procession as great, gorgeous, glorious, unequalled by anything of the kind. The Kilmarnock procession was no doubt a *larger* or *longer* array, but yesterday's far surpassed it in *grandeur*. Oh, what an array of magnificent horses, and so splendidly caparisoned !" We read that "two cakes of shortbread, baked by the two nieces of the poet, the Misses Begg, of Ayr," were presented to the Earl of Roseberry. The poet's fondness for the lasses was proverbial. Characteristically enough, Mrs Hill's conception of him has been embodied by the sculptor's handicraft. "Miss Jeannie Armour Brown, great-grand-daughter, through his eldest son, of the poet, presented the sculptor, Mrs D. O. Hill, with an exquisite bouquet of flowers, placed in an elegant silver bouquet-holder. The likeness between Miss Brown and the best portraits of the poet is almost marvellous, and it is one of the best testimonies that could be borne to the success of Mrs Hill's work, that between this young lady's face and the face of the statue the same striking resemblance is seen."

The chairman of the Statue Committee is reputed to have spoken equally eulogistic of the artist's excellence as exhibited in the chiselled memorial of Burns. "It is the life-like image of the Peasant King of Song, whose matchless genius has given a tongue of fire to all the manlier sentiments in every quarter of the globe. It is a life-like portraiture in marble of the greatest of the citizens of Dumfries. It is the face and the figure of Robert Burns, who, in the springtime of his fame, was enrolled among the burgesses of Dumfries; who, in the after gloom of neglect and the early autumn of his days, solitarily and sorrowfully paced the shadowy side of our street, where he will now stand for ever on the crown and centre of the causeway. In the auld kirkyard in the southern end of our town, in the vault of a Grecian temple, which is one of the world's shrines, the mortal remains of the poet are mixed with kindred dust. Here, in the clear open space of the northern end of the High street, not in the centre of the dead, but in the thoroughfare of the living, we symbolise his immortal self in imperishable marble. It is a work of genius to commemorate genius. It is the work of a woman to commemorate him who sang more sweetly than any other the praise of woman. It is 'man of woman born.' It is a splendid triumph of art." You may call this worship of Burns by the name of idolatry, if you will, but it is a great fact that his fame is actually spreading abroad over the face of the world. Mr. Thomas McKie justly said that "the crowds who throng our streets to-day, to show their affection for the poet, prove the truth of this criticism. But the numbers here present are as nothing compared with the thousands of unseen, silent spectators in every part of the globe, whose bosoms will thrill with emotion when they read the account of this

day's proceedings, and that another laurel crown has been bound around the brow of Burns. Seven Grecian cities strive for the honour of having given birth to Homer. In Burns' case there is happily no such dubiety. Ayrshire is entitled to the honour of his birth, but Dumfriesshire was the land of his adoption, and in this town his sacred ashes repose.

The Thames flows proudly to the sea,
Where royal cities stately stand;
But sweeter flows the Nith to me,
Where Comyn's once had high command.

Here the poet lived and moved, and went about his daily duties. He walked our streets, he mused on and drew inspiration from our own beautiful river; and in the short space of thirty-seven years he did more for 'puir auld Scotland's sake' than any man had done since the days of Bruce. As the Italians love and honour their Dante, the Germans their Goethe, the French their Voltaire, the English their Shakespeare, so we Scotchmen love and have the right to love and honour Burns. For we feel that it was mainly owing to him that Scotland is entitled to rank in intellectual pre-eminence with the greatest nations of the earth. The debt we owe him is immense, and nothing but endless gratitude can wipe it out. When Garibaldi made a present of a kingdom to the King of Italy, everyone felt that he had done a noble act, and made humanity his debtor. But I doubt if that action, great and unselfish though it was, will, in its beneficial effects, bear comparison with that more precious and generous gift which Burns gave to the Scottish nation and the world in his imperishable songs. These are the true music of humanity, which has cheered and delighted the hearts of thousands in the past, and will continue to cheer and delight the hearts of thousands in the times to come. In his glorious song of 'A man's a man for a' that,' Burns anticipated his age by a hundred years, and laid the foundation for a higher morality and code of international law than exists at present, when men shall beat their spears into pruning-books and learn the art of war no more. This song, and a hundred others of equal value, the poet wrote here, and left them as a legacy to the world; and this he did *all for love*, and nothing for reward."

Lord Young, the chairman at the banquet, might well have asked, as he did, "whether the statue of any dead man, be he warrior, statesman, or poet—whether the unveiling of the statue of any man who has been dead these eighty-six years—would have elsewhere in the world attracted such a crowd, excited such an enthusiastic demonstration as that which we witnessed to-day?" Carlyle tells us that Burns "was the largest soul of all the British lands—the most gifted British soul we had in all that century of his." What! Burns a greater man than Pope, Swift, Johnson, Adam Smith, Hume, Robertson, and Gibbon! Greater than Nelson, Wellington, Fox, Burke, and Chatham! "The withered, unbelieving, second-hand eighteenth century" produced these men; and, as Lord Young said, "unless we are to draw the line very tight, and exclude those who were chiefly developed after it closed, and its successor opened, it produced Scott, Byron, Campbell, Wordsworth, Coleridge, Southey, Carlyle," &c. Yes, we quite assent to the assertion, "that Burns was the greatest British soul that the century produced."

One of the speakers at the banquet made a characteristic remark—"Wherever Scotchmen went abroad, first and foremost they would have the Presbyterian Church, and thou they would have the Burns Club." Another wag dissented from that statement, and "ventured to say, from his own experience of his countrymen abroad, that the first thing they did was to establish a Burns Club." The fact was, from Burns' description of what it ought to be, it did not take a large community to make a Burns Club. In one of his verses he puts this distinctly before them, that two men of kindred minds can form a Club anywhere—

Here's a han', my trusty frien',
An' gie's a han' o' thine;
An' we'll tak' a richt gude willie-waught
For auld lang syne.

Two men, with that verse as their motto, could form a Burns Club; but it was another matter to establish a kirk abroad. It was not so easy in these days of confessions of faith, *Scotch sermons*, shorter catechisms, and many other things to attend to; the Burns Club had no other belief but a thorough belief in Robert Burns. One of the conditions was that he should have a copy of Burns in his pocket, and, to supplement the bargain, a little of the light wine of the country. Burns' fame was increasing as we increased in years. The latest movement was by the Glasgow Club to have a memorial of Burns placed in Westminster Abbey. Well, the statue of Lord Byron was not allowed to be placed in Westminster Abbey; but Darwin—who did a great deal to degrade human

nature—was interred therein. Surely, then, no objection can be raised against the admission of a memorial of Burns into Westminster Abbey. Lord Young—as chairman of the banquet—in proposing the memory of Burns, said:—"As children they became acquainted with the works of Burns, with the advancing years they grew in knowledge of them, and in age they still love and admire them. At the present time it is scarcely possible to think of any human being in these realms who has not heard of them. The poetry of Burns is suited to every varying mood of the human mind; but while it is by turns cheerful and sad, it expresses the hate of the poet for everything mean and contemptible and hypocritical. While it solaces that feeling of melancholy which will sometimes possess a man, it teaches high lessons for everyday life." Councillor Thomson said that "it had been well expressed that Burns was a man who hated hypocrisy; but he did more, he exposed it with burning scorn, and it would be well if they strove, as he had done, to crush a vice which was rife in their midst. They should dare to be honest; and although the present might slip away without any recognition of it, although

they might be misunderstood or misinterpreted, the time would come when the people would say, 'He was an honest man.' Looking back over the vista of years, from the applauding multitude of to-day to the figure of the poet, slowly with mind in rebellious and remorseful mood, moving along under the shadows of the houses here, avoided by rich and poor alike, we could realise how far the people of Dumfries of that day failed to discover or understand the greatness and daring honesty of his mind. However, he had given us this solace under opprobrium or neglect, 'The man's the man for a' that.' They had witnessed that day the spectacle of a posterity striving to retrieve the errors of the past; and they read in every eager face the truth he prophesied, that, although Burns was dead, yet his works lived, and would live in the hearts of the people; for, while in one mind he lived in the 'Cottar's Saturday Night,' in another there lingered the refrain 'Man's inhumanity to man makes countless thousands mourn,' and 'Why has man the will and power to make his fellow mourn?'" In the great procession "The dairymen and dairymaids occupied the first place among unofficial bodies. They formed quite a gay cavalcade. Two large waggonettes had been engaged for the conveyance of the dairymaids, of whom there were six-and-thirty, all pink as daisies, in neat print dresses, and upholding the reputation of our dale; for

Fairer than our Nithsdale fair,
Or handsomer, there's nane elsewhere.

The male members of the detachment, numbering exactly two dozen, each bestrode his own steed, all of which were suitably decked. A handsome flag, specially painted for the occasion, was borne by the party. It represented a scene of rural courtship—a stalwart swain, in whom a resemblance to Burns could be traced, enfolding a fair one in his arms, the river flowing beside them, cows crossing at a ford near by, and the farm house being observed in the distance. The language of the poet was called in further to illustrate the sentiment of the poet, by the quotation of the lines—

For tae woo a bonnie lassie
When the kye comes hame.

and—

Wilt thou be my dearie?

According to Mr. M'Kie, "three great demonstrations or pro-processions have taken place in regard to Burns. The first took place about eighty-six years ago; and I have been told by one who was an eye-witness of that procession that it left the Town Hall on a beautiful summer afternoon, passed down High street and along to the old churchyard slowly and solemnly, followed by the great and the honoured of the land, and by the municipality of this burgh, who laid Robert Burns in his grave. That is the first procession. One noted person attended that funeral—Allan Cunningham. He was then a boy of fourteen years of age, a stonemason to trade, and he has related what he saw in the most life-like manner. Another person was present at that procession, Mr. Carlyle, from Ecclefechan, the father of Thomas Carlyle. He told his young friend what he had seen, and this is now distinctly set forth in the memoirs of Carlyle, which show that his thirst for literary ambition was fired and stimulated when he saw the great honour paid by the intellectual world to the genius of Robert Burns. Years rolled by. The sons of the poet went abroad and entered the army, and after an honourable career they came home bronzed with the sun of India. At that time it occurred to a well-known literary man in this

country—Professor Wilson—that a great honour should be paid to these sons on the banks of Doon. Lord Eglinton presided there at the procession, and Professor Wilson delivered one of his glowing panegyrics on the poet. That demonstration was a great honour to the family of Burns. Another procession has taken place to-day; and if we may judge from what we have seen in the immense gathering on the streets, I would say it was the greatest of all demonstrations that have yet been shown for the love and affection of Burns." It was a gratifying feature of the banquet to notice the hearty meed of praise given to Mr. M'Dowall, who, "with his pen and otherwise, had amply done his part in regard to the movement."

Reference was made by one of the speakers to Mr M'Dowall's "History of Dumfriesshire," and his descriptive account "of the last days of Burns in Dumfries." All seemed to be full of admiration of "the gifted lady whose genius and skill have realised for us our dream in the splendid statue so successfully unveiled."

Mr. M'Dowall in proposing the health of the fair artist, said—"There are two classes of poets—one who brood fondly and long over a theme, and after much skilful handling send it forth to the world; the other so creative, impulsive, and impassioned that they cannot, dare not, keep silence, but must give utterance to the burning thoughts with which their hearts are filled. Of this latter class was Robert Burns. There are also two classes of artists—one plodding and painstaking, who after long study work out an idea with less or more success; the other, who use the peucil or the chisel in order to realise some great conception that has entered their minds, they cannot tell how, and which, when completed, bears the stamp of inspiration. I rather think the gifted artist of the Dumfries statue to Burns, Mrs Hill, belongs to the inspired class of artists. The model from which the figure was cut was a work which she felt herself, as it were, compelled to undertake. It was not manipulated according to order, but was the full, free, fresh, spontaneous emanation of her own creative fancy; hence in a great degree the completeness of the success. Just as Burns himself in his early years indulged in the fine aspiration quoted by our chairman, so Mrs. Hill felt in her girlhood an irresistible desire to do something in the domain of art that would body forth her own ardent love for the memory of Burns, and might be accepted by the Scottish nation as no unworthy tribute to the bard. We know the result; and do we not owe a debt of gratitude to Mrs. Hill for realising successfully her own high and happy conception of her theme by the production of a figure that satisfies the claims of art, and at the same time secures for itself the acclamations of the populace. When about a month ago the statue was placed upon its pedestal, the veil required to be temporarily removed, and the figure stood revealed for a while to an interested crowd of onlookers, a sensation was experienced by them of mingled pleasure and awe, as if the very poet, who had a hundred years ago and less trod the acres of Ellisland and the streets of Dumfries, had taken up his permanent abode in our midst. The effect was electrical; and a similar sensation must have been felt by thousands of people to-day when the drapery was cast aside, and the figure was seen in all its truthfulness and beauty. How beautifully Longfellow sings of Burns—

For now he haunts his native land
As an immortal youth; his hand
Guides every plough;
He sits beside each ingle nook,
His voice is in each rustling brook,
Each rustling bough.

But the mass of beholders to-day felt as if not only was this the case, but that the *dear guest* of whom the poet speaks had come to us in living bodily form. Burns himself, attired as a farmer, seems to stand before them surrounded by accessories that gave additional actuality to the scene; the pipe, emblematic of Scottish song; the wee timorous beasties of which he wrote so tenderly; the collie Luath seemingly quite ready to leap from its position should any Newfoundland dog show face, and enter with it into a long digression about the "lads o' the creation;" the left-hand of the poet holding a cluster of "the wee crimson tippet-flowers," on which he seems to muse. To Burns' love of nature the surroundings of the statue give ample justice, Mrs. Hill remembering that—

The opening gowan wat wi' dew,
He turned wi' the beauteous thought and theme;
The humblest bud the green earth gave
His song has made supreme.
Ayr, Irvine, Logan, Doon, and Nith,
Through hazels, birks, or broom, or ferns,

Gleam in a hallowed glory with
The deathless songs of Burns.

Sheriff Nicolson's remarks on the poet are specially deserving of commendation and publication—"No poet ever lived who has been the subject of so many speeches as Robert Burns, and to say anything new about him is impossible. But what of that? If men were bound to be original on the topics most interesting to mankind, we should have no sermons or love-songs. The old, old story is the most interesting still; and after all that has been said about Robert Burns, the subject will never grow old, any more than the freshness of dawn, or the bright looks of Apollo ever young. Eighty-six years ago, in this street, he walked a king of men, loved and honoured by many, feared and shunned by some, who, perhaps, felt that they were being seen through by those great piercing eyes of his. There are, perhaps, such people still even in Dumfries. If so, I am really sorry for them. I am wae to think upon them; but if such there be, Scotland is Scotland yet, and, as a Highland bard said about Prince Charlie, they might be hanged and quartered, but Charlie could not be torn out of their hearts! So Scotland may say of Robert Burns. His memory, wherever kindly Scots are met, is as dear and warm as was his own large heart, as fresh as the face of nature, for ever being renewed. Yes, while the Nith flows to the sea, and Criffel towers above it, while daisies spring from the green earth, while larks rise to Heaven's gate and sing, while human hearts throb with pleasure or pain, while human eyes glisten with smiles or tears, so long will perennial greenness flourish round the pure fountain of Burns' song. Why is it that no other poet, ancient or modern, was ever so much loved as Robert Burns? Just because he loved so much, and so tenderly, men and women and children, the beasts of the earth, the fowls of the air, the flowers of the field, and every living creature. 'If I could,' he said, 'and I believe I do it as far as I can, I would wipe away all tears from all' eyes.' The lesson was taught to him by the vision and the faculty divine to despise no creature that God had made; to respect humanity above all, to sympathise with and see its merits under rags, to see through its poverty and meanness under stately robes and crowns, and every guise of respectability. Theology may frown, hypocrisy may shudder, but true it is that this all-embracing love is heavenly; the most human is the most divine. It was the highest glory of the gospel that it was proclaimed to the poor; and Robert Burns is, of all poets ever born, the one whom the poor may with joy and pride claim as their brother. Hear on that point the words of another Scottish poet, who, next to Thomas Carlyle, did more than any other to vindicate the fame of Scotland's beloved poet, I mean Professor Wilson: 'The poor man, as he speaks of Robert Burns, holds up his head and regards you with an elated look. . . . Who were they who in his own country continued most steadfastly to honour his genius and himself all through what have been called, truly in some respects, falsely in others, his dark days in Dumfries, and on his death-bed? Not lords and earls, not lawyers and wits, not philosophers and doctors, though among the nobility and gentry, among the classes of leisure and learning, he had friends who wished him well. . . . But the men of his own order, with their wives and daughters, shepherds, herdsmen, ploughmen, delvers, ditchers, hewers of wood and drawers of water, soldiers and sailors, whether regulars, militia, fencibles, volunteers, on board kings' or merchants' ships, or dirt gabbart—the working people,—whatever the instruments of their toil, they patronised Burns then, they patronise him now; they would not have hurt a hair of his head; they will not hear of any dishonour to his dust. They know well what it is to endure, to yield, to enjoy, and to suffer, and the memory of their own bard will be hallowed for ever among the brotherhood like a religion. The homage which we pay on such an occasion as this to the memory of Robert Burns is no mere idolatry of genius, as some foolishly think. It is the just tribute to the living embodiment, in their most attractive form, of the feelings and virtues that have made our nation what it is; not less because of the knowledge that he sinned and suffered like a true son of Adam, a partaker of our common clay. We love him none the less because he was not perfect, because our admiration is so dashed with sorrow, our pride and joy mingled with tears. Blessings on them who have added to our physical well-being, who have diminished our pains, who have enlarged our knowledge, who have fought for our freedom. Blessings not less be on them who have cheered so many drooping spirits with the divine ministry of song—songs that often gushed from hearts breathing with anguish.

Blessings be with them and eternal praise,
Who gave us nobler lives and nobler cares;
The poets who on earth have made us heirs
Of truth, and pure delights, by heavenly lays.

Of that glorious fellowship of shining ones, none of any age or nation left so rich a legacy of songs to his

country as Robert Burns. Not less truly may it be said of him than Milton did of Shakespeare—

Dear son of memory, great heir of fame,
What needst thou such weak witness of thy name.

Even more emphatically we may say of Robert Burns that he needs no monument of brass or marble. His real monument is more enduring, *acre perennius*. He is enshrined in a place safe against the tooth of time—in the heart of Scotland and of mankind. But though he needs no monument, least of all in this place where his dust was laid after life's fitful fever, amid Scotland's tears yet we may congratulate this town on the beautiful tribute to his memory, which will now take its place among her chief ornaments. It is an additional cause of pleasure to me, in looking at that statue, and I think it gives special interest to the work, and would have made it valued more by the poet himself if he could have known of it, that it is from the hand of a woman. That lady is one of a family to which genius has been largely imparted, and widow of a poetic painter whose name is associated indelibly with the land of Burns—D. O. Hill. True artists, like poets, have poetic pains, but they have also their compensation. The works of their own hands are their monuments, and if like this, worthy of the subject, they have the unspeakable pleasure of knowing that they will be, to unborn generations, a joy for ever. Like the perfect woman described by King Lemuel, their own works praise them in the gates. A man of great taste and judgment, whom some of us have known and esteemed equally as a lawyer and a poet, the late Sheriff Glassford Bell, said that Mrs Hill's representation of Burns was the truest he had seen. In that opinion I humbly concur. There are four places now in Scotland specially sacred by reason of the tombs they contain—Iona, Dunfermline, Dryburgh, and Dumfries. I will not compare them, for they are all dear and holy ground. I will only say that there is no bit of Scottish ground more sacred to a Scottish heart, more full of solemn and tender teaching, than that lair up in St. Michael's church-yard, where lies the honoured dust of Robert Burns."

So much for the Dumfries demonstration held to the honour and glory and everlasting remembrance of Robert Burns.

Walker's Life of Chalmers.

The Rev. Norman L. Walker has favoured the republic of letters with a nice little book on Dr. Chalmers' centenary. It comprises 176 pages, setting forth Scotland's greatest philanthropist in his life, and deducing practical lessons there from. All the salient events of his remarkable career are lucidly expounded. "The gift of a truly great man is the very greatest which can be bestowed upon a generation. The discovery of a gold or diamond mine must ever be a notable event in any country's history. It tends to increase its population, and to add in many ways to its material comforts. But wealth of that sort has its drawbacks, and neither California nor Australia has been, on the whole, much the better for its riches. There can be no doubt, however, about the permanent benefits conferred by a man who has at once genius and grace. It is not too much to say of him that he contributes to the enlargement of even the temporal resources of the community to which he belongs; for when people become more intelligent, and honest, and industrious, and frugal, they come to have what is really equivalent to gold. In any case, by making his age more virtuous, he makes it happier. Such a man, therefore, is a great gift of God, and it is light that that fact should be rendered conspicuous. For this reason we are always kept in doubt as to where our next luminary is to appear. That we may realise the existence of a divine government, God keeps the reins in his own hands, and sends leaders as he thinks best. We cannot make them. We cannot command their appearance when we please. And when one comes we are bound to regard the circumstance as a new and special act of divine interposition in the affairs of men." Humanly speaking, who would have expected such a genius as Chalmers from an obscure old Fife burgh? Yet Anstruther—not Edinburgh, nor Glasgow, nor Aberdeen—produced Thomas Chalmers. As the poet Cowper has finely written—

God moves in a mysterious way
His wonders to perform."

Of one thing we may be absolutely certain, "whenever there is a work to do, God finds one to do it." Chalmers was born on the 17th March, 1780. In my centenary oration I made a mistake about his age when he entered St. Andrews. It appears that he was matriculated before he was twelve. I had supposed he was thirteen.

Chalmers showed an early predisposition for the study of Mathematics. "It is not a dry and mechanical study, in which there is nothing to stir the enthusiasm of ingenuous youth. Its fascinations are manifold and

overpowering." He also cultivated the study of ethics and politics. He was licensed to preach on the 31st July, 1799. He was little more than 19 years; but being "a lad of pregnant parts," he was received into the ministry at that very early age. He delivered his first sermon in Wigan. James, his brother, said of him on that occasion that "his mode of delivery was expressive, his language beautiful, and his arguments very forcible and strong. His sermon contained a due mixture both of the doctrinal and practical parts of religion, but I think it inclined rather more to the latter." We are told that "his mathematical studies seemed to occupy more of his time than the religious." He attended a session of the mathematical class of Professor Play fair. Next session, 1800, he "gave himself up to the study of chemistry." He was not very desirous of getting a call to the pulpit. Edwards' book on the "Freedom of the Will," and Godwin on the "Doctrine of Necessity" attracted very early his attention; but Chalmers very soon discovered "that Edwards had by far the more sublime conceptions of the two. Teaching that the whole series of events in the spiritual as well as in the material universe are linked unalterably together, he showed behind these not a blind law, but a living person—God—directing freely the development of the system." He became successively assistant minister at Cavers, and about two years afterwards he was transferred to Kilmany. While he was in Cavers he acted as assistant to Professor Vilant in the Mathematical chair. He passed, therefore, another session in academic labour, besides his spiritual functions. He was ordained minister of Kilmany on the 12th May, 1803. His services as tutor of mathematics were dispensed with, and Chalmers conceived that he had been slighted by Professor Vilant on the ground of want of competency. He resented the insult, opened a private class in opposition to the University; also one on chemistry. His cause prevailed, and the professors gave him the right hand of friendship. Kilmany got very little attention that winter. He went out every Saturday to preach and returned on Monday morning to St Andrews. He bearded both the Presbytery and the *Senatus Academicus* on the question of pluralities. In 1804 he applied for the chair of Natural Philosophy in St. Andrews, and for the Professorship of Mathematics in Edinburgh, and was unsuccessful. He wrote a stinging pamphlet, in which he asserted that "after the satisfactory discharge of his parish duties, a minister might enjoy five days in the week of uninterrupted leisure for the prosecution of any science in which his taste may dispose him to engage. The great doctrines of revelation, though sublime, are simple. They require no labour of the midnight oil to understand them; no parade of artificial language to impress them upon the hearts of the people." A man of genius like Chalmers can, indeed, find it easy to write sermons, but it is far otherwise with the common herd of preachers. He afterwards repudiated his own pamphlet. On the doctrine of atonement he was not very sound at this period. "In what particular manner the death of our Redeemer affected the remission of our sins, or rather why that death was made a condition of this remission, seems to be an unrevealed point in the Scriptures. Perhaps the God of Nature meant to illustrate the purity of his perfection to the children of men; perhaps it was efficacious in promoting the improvements and confirming the virtue of other orders of being. The tenets of those whose gloomy and unenlarged minds are apt to imagine that the Author of Nature required the death of Jesus merely for the reparation of violated justice, are rejected by all free and rational inquirers." Chalmers was a philosopher, and taught that "the rewards of heaven are allied to the exercise of our virtuous affections. The faith of Christianity is praiseworthy and meritorious only because it is derived from the influence of virtuous sentiments upon the mind. Let us tremble to think that anything but virtue can commend us to the Almighty. True, our best endeavours fall short of perfection, and after all, we may be called unprofitable servants. But contemplating the wonders of redeeming love, and finding all the deficiencies of his imperfect virtue supplied by the atonement and propitiation of Jesus, we may go on our course rejoicing, assured that through Christ our sincere but imperfect obedience is looked down upon by Heaven with a propitious eye." His method of a sinner's justification is not orthodox nor Calvinistic.

Chalmers fulminated from his pulpit against Buonaparte. "May that day when Buonaparte ascends the throne of Britain be the last of my existence; may I be the first to ascend the scaffold he erects to extinguish the worth and spirit of the country; may my blood mingle with the blood of patriots; and may I die at the foot of that altar on which British independence is to be the victim." The French revolution led him to study his favourite subject—political economy,—and he published a book thereon. Chalmers "possessed in an extraordinary measure a freshness, fire, originality, and inventiveness of mind, which revealed the presence in him of that peculiar quality which we call genius; a wonderful power of acute and exact observation; and a whole-souled out-goingness of nature, which made it certain that wherever he was set down he would not be a contemplative dreamer, but a very active force in life."

Dunedin Review.

"The Prophets of Israel."

This is a very remarkable book. Its advent in 1882 marks a new era in the history of Presbyterianism in particular; and, indeed, for that matter, in the records of Christianity. The Hebrew prophets occupy a conspicuous position in history. This volume brings us down to the close of the eight century B.C. The lectures, eight in number, are long and prolix, each of them embraces between 40 and 50 pages. This is, indeed, a critical, but not an original, age. Professor Robertson Smith is great in historical science, in criticism, and in Rationalism. What Niebuhr has done to Roman history, legends, and traditions, our Professor has done to Hebrew literature. The notion that the Pentateuch is older than all the prophetic books, is, in the Professor's estimate, quite fallacious. "The priestly legislation did not exist before the exile." Historical criticism has demonstrated the fallacy of this opinion. The prophets were the successive messengers of God to keep alive the flame of religion, more or less pure, in the midst of heathenism. They educated the people from a state of *spiritual childhood* gradually upwards to a more or less clear conception of monotheism in the midst of degrading polytheism. Professor Smith teaches "the doctrine of an organic development in the plan of revelation and redemption." God is represented as specially dealing with chosen individuals. A personal knowledge of God and His will—and without personal knowledge there can be no true religion—involves a personal dealing of God with men. This is the key of revelation. But, how do we know that the prophets "got revelation by personal relation from God himself?" Professor Smith says, and says truly, "To say that God speaks to all men alike, and gives the same communication directly to all without the use of a revealing agency, reduces religion to mysticism. In point of fact, it is not true in the case of any man that what he believes and knows of God has come to him directly through the voice of nature and conscience." Precisely so. Our ideas are hereditary, the result of experience. But, in the first instance, when "new truth acquired as all new truth is by some particular man or circle of men," dawns upon the mind, does not that revelation emanate, indirectly if you will, from God through the voice of nature and conscience? Then, how am I to know that the prophet is not a conscious or an unconscious impostor? Our Professor falls back upon an idea—which 16 years ago I had enunciated in my article upon inspiration in the first number of the "Delphic Oracle." The idea is not original. "There is an external evidence of the truth of the Biblical revelation which lies behind the question of the supernatural; as it is usually stated, an evidence which lies, not in the miraculous circumstances of this or that particular act of revelation, but in the intrinsic character of the scheme of revelation as a whole. It is a general law of human history that truth is consistent, progressive and imperishable, while every falsehood is self-contradictory, and ultimately falls to pieces." Truth—not miracle—is the test of religion. The prophets are only higher tribunes—censors and covenanters. "The basis of the prophetic religion is the conception of a unique relation between Jehovah and Israel—Israel as a national unity." The medium of mutual communication is the prophet and the priest. From this fountain flowed civil "liberty, law, justice, and the moral order of society." The prophets inculcated civil righteousness, as directly flowing from the maintenance of a "national feeling and national faith in Jehovah." In prosperity God is with His people. "The presence of Jehovah with His people was quite fully realised in the hour of battle and of victory." In adversity this feeling was more difficult of national realisation. But the prophets—the true messengers of God—as contradistinguished from the false and mercenary, never weary of reminding Israel "that it was one nation, with a national destiny, and a national God."

It is true indeed that every pagan tribe or nation had "its tribal or national God." The rituals of all were in many points similar, but Israel alone rose to the true conception of "a mono-theistic faith." Mr Smith explodes the idea that Israel only was a theocracy. This "was not the idea that gave to the religion of Israel its unique character." But the prophets alone recognised the idea "that it was Jehovah's supreme providence which had determined the migrations of all nations just as much as of Israel." Wherein lay their characteristic difference, then? This lay "in what Jehovah had to say, rather than in the external manner of saying it."

Jehovah was superior to all other gods. Until the time of Jeremiah, the Jews "did not give to the abstract doctrine of monotheism the importance that it possesses to our minds." The difference between Jehovah and the other deities "was not placed in his spiritual nature." Mr Smith gives ample citations from the Bible to express "the spirituality of the godhead which the Old Testament contains, and they are not directed to distinguish between the true God and false gods, but to characterise the godhead in its difference from human nature. It is, in fact, the divine working, rather than the divine nature, that the Hebrew Scriptures regard as spiritual—that is, as possessing a subtle and invisible character, comparable with the mysterious movements of the wind. The common doctrine of the Old Testament is, not that God is spirit, but that the spirit of Jehovah, going forth from Him, works in the world and among men. And this is no metaphysical doctrine; it simply expresses that difference between divine and human agency which must be recognised wherever there is belief in God, or at least any belief rising above the grossest fetichism. That the early Israelites possessed no metaphysical doctrine of the spirituality of Jehovah, conceived as an existence out of all relation to space and time, is plain, from the fact that the Old Testament never stripped off the idea that Jehovah's contact with earth has a special relation to special places." They had no metaphysical conception of God. He was adored "as a living personal force." The

Gentile philosophers and Christian divines alone expatiated on His metaphysical attributes of eternal, infinite, &c.

"Apart from the doctrine of the resurrection, of which nothing is heard till the later books of the Old Testament, the religion of the Hebrews has to do with this life." After death, men pass away into "the shadowy realm of Sheol." In this respect they are like the pagan nations "The Hebrew doctrine of retribution is essentially a doctrine of retribution on earth. Death is itself a final judgment. The religion of the Hebrews does not rest on a philosophy of the unseen universe. The sphere of religion is the present life, and the truths of religion are the truths of an everyday experience, in which Jehovah is as living and personal an actor as men are." Unlike heathen deities, Jehovah has "a personal character—a will and purpose of His own—a purpose rising above the current ideas of His worshippers, and a will directed with steady consistency to a moral aim. All His dealings with Israel were directed to lead people to higher things than their natural character inclined towards. Jehovah vindicated His sovereignty in the very events that proved fatal to the gods of the Gentiles." The prophets interpreted His will and character to the sceptical politicians and the superstitious masses. His character is depicted by them as consistent throughout. He desires the true happiness of Israel, and His religion is moral. "Jehovah is a God of righteousness, whose dealings with His people follow an ethical standard." The prophets put morality on a far sounder basis than any other religion. "The fundamental superiority of the Hebrew religion does not lie in the particular system of social morality that it enforces, but in the more absolute and self-consistent righteousness of the Divine Judge." Elijah inculcates, even above patriotism, "that divine truth and civil righteousness are more than all the counsels of statecraft." He represented Jehovah as a "pre-eminently jealous God, who could endure no rival in His land, nor in the affections of His people."

Mr Smith gives "an exact inversion of the common representation of the function of the prophets." They are not mere interpreters of the law; nor does he place their originality in their predictions, They were rather great heroes in critical moments—national reformers. The idea of schools of the prophets, according to our author, "is a pure invention of commentators." The prophets forcibly taught that "the sovereignty of Jehovah was not an empty thought; it was the refuge of the oppressed, the support of the weak against the mighty." Well might Carlyle style them "the grand old Hebrew prophets!" And so indeed they were.

The isolation of Israel was the natural result of the prophetic dogma of Jehovah's jealousy, despite all the corruption and venality of both the prophets and priests. Hosea tells us that in his times "the whole idea of right and wrong was reduced to a money standard, and the moral sense of the community was proportionally debased in every relation of life. Prophecy had sunk to a mere trade." Still we can see clearly "the progress of the religion of Jehovah from Moses to Elijah." The Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch our author sets aside. "It was practically buried, many of its most central laws being quite ignored by the best kings and the most enlightened priests." It had no existence till a much later date. "Neither Amos nor Hosea alludes to an extant written law." The prophets, however, reveal God's character to the people by history and admonition. Joshua, portions of Deuteronomy, and "the main thread of kings" are also of much more recent date than that accepted. "In the time of Amos and Hosea, the truest hearts and best thinkers of Israel did not yet interpret Jehovah's dealings with His people in the light of the Deuteronomic and Levitical laws." In due time traditions and legends took a written shape. The earlier history of Israel is simply "the transcript of a vivid oral tradition." Some of the prophecies resemble the Ossianic poems. Israel had to contend all along with two dangers—ancient heathenism and the gods of the Amorites. In these two ways lies the danger of departing from God. "With Israel Jehovah held personal converse" through his prophets and priests. Amos, the shepherd of the desert, hears, or fancies he hears, the call of God, "Go, prophecy to my people Israel." Having "heard the thunder of Jehovah's shout," he girds on his prophetic mantle. Through him "God declares himself to Israel formally, as a man does to a friend. *To seek God* is the old Hebrew phrase for consulting His oracle, asking His help or decision in difficult affairs of conduct or law; and by ancient usage Jehovah was habitually sought at the sanctuary, though the phrase is equally applicable to consulting a prophet. What Jehovah requires of them that seek Him is the practice of civil righteousness." God, according to Amos, demands righteousness and not sacrifice. "The sinners of Israel are the corrupt rulers and their associates, the unjust and sensual oppressors, the men who have no regard to civil righteousness." These must be destroyed preparatory to a national reformation. The problem of the lost tribes—according to Mr Smith—is a purely fanciful one. They lapsed amongst the heathens, and lost their religion and distinctive nationality. Hosea's prophecies are "marked by a tone of deep pathos, akin to that of Jeremiah, and expressive of the tragic isolation of the prophet's position in a society corrupt to the very core, and visibly hastening towards dissolution." Priest and prophet are included in his condemnation. Like the warnings of Cassandra, his message is treated with derision. "Indignation and sorrow, tenderness and severity, faith in the sovereignty of Jehovah's love, and a despairing sense of Israel's infidelity, are woven together in a sequence which has no logical plan, but is determined by the battle and alternate victory of contending emotions; and the swift transitions, the fragmentary, unbalanced utterance, the half-developed

allusions, that make his prophecy so difficult to the commentator, express the agony of this inward conflict. Hosea, above all other prophets, was a man of deep affections, of a gentle poetic nature. His heart is too true and tender to snap the bonds of country and kindred, or mingle aught of personal bitterness with the severity of Jehovah's words. Alone in the midst of a nation that knows not Jehovah, without disciple or friend, without the solace of domestic affection, for even his home was full of shame and sorrow, he yet clings to Israel with inextinguishable love. The doom which he proclaims against his people is the doom of all that is dearest to him on earth; his heart is ready to break with sorrow, his *very* reason totters under the awful vision of judgment, his whole prophecy is a long cry of anguish, as again and again he renews his appeal to the heedless nation that is running headlong to destruction." A man of emotion—not logic, a poet, not a preacher, Hosea teaches that "the relation between Jehovah and Israel is a relation of love, and of such duties as flow from love." The modern distinction between religious and moral duties was unknown then. "Amos bases religion on morality. Hosea deduces morality from religion" Amos might be classed with rationalists, Hosea with the mystics. "To Amos and Hosea alike the true standard of religious life is the standard of conduct." But the religion of the one is more spiritual than that of the other. Amos preaches civil righteousness; Hosea looks behind and beneath for a disposition of love in the heart, as the motive power of conduct. Amos deals with the nation collectively; Hosea, as a moral individual. "Jacob is, in fact, the nation summed up in the person of its ancestor." God's love downwards is felt to be unchangeable. Hosea traces the relations of Israel to Jehovah from the days of Jacob. It is a continuous history of love to Israel—Israel is Jehovah's spouse—Ephraim is Jehovah's son. God is the husband and lord of the nation. Israel is also His son. Jehovah has spoken much to His son by the ministry of His prophets. But still more tenderly is Jehovah's love pictured in the idea of a husband to his spouse. Both ideas are of pagan origin. Jehovah's revelation is better conceived under human analogies than by any abstract reasoning. "It is a special characteristic of the Hebrew prophets that they identify themselves with Jehovah's word and will so completely that their personality seems often to be lost in His." The prophets hear God's voice, and "God speaks in the events of history and the events of human life. He spoke to Amos in the thundering march of the Assyrians, and He spoke to Hosea in the shame that blighted his house. Gomer's infidelity after marriage is a figure of Israel's departure from the covenant of God; and the struggle of Hosea's affection, with the burning sense of shame and grief when he found his wife unfaithful, is altogether inconceivable unless his first love had been pure, and full of trust in the purity of its object." Smith treats this episode as literal, not allegorical. "The faithlessness of Israel to Jehovah, the long-suffering of God, the moral discipline of sorrow and tribulation by which He will bring back His erring people, and betroth it to Himself for ever in righteousness, truth, and love, are depicted under the figure of the relation of a husband to his erring spouse." The prophet regarded and "recognised the unhappiness of his married life as no meaningless calamity, but the ordinance of Jehovah, which called him to the work of a prophet. This he expresses by saying that it was in directing him to marry Gomer that Jehovah first spoke to him." But, alas, "the kingdom of Ephraim, in all its dynasties, rests on a principle of godless anarchy." The religious condition of Judah, according to Isaiah, was characterised by the most abject superstition. The Judean prophets frequently refer to magic and divination, "such as the consultation of familiar spirits through *wizards that peep and mutter*—a kind of ventriloquists."

Isaiah seems to have held up the torch of prophecy for about 40 years, and "his influence was at its height during the expedition of Sennacherib in 701 B.C. He held a commanding position in the state, being a man of good connections. Practically he was the Palinurus of Judah; next to David the most notable man in Israel. "Presumably Isaiah himself issued no collected edition of all his prophecies, but only put forth from time to time individual oracles or minor collections, which were gathered together at a later date, and on no plan which we can follow." All his oracles would not amount, in point of bulk, to one number of the "Dunedin Review," or "Delphic Oracle." "The collection of all remains of ancient prophecy, digested into the four books named, from Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekial, and the twelve minor prophets, was not formed till after the time of Ezra, 250 years after the death of Isaiah."

Our author's aim appears to be "to study the prophetic word in the light of the history of the prophet's own times." Isaiah's inaugural vision "in which he received his prophetic consecration" is highly poetical, and the phraseology is borrowed from the features of the Temple of Jerusalem. The whole language is "the necessary pictorial clothing of the supreme truth that in this vision his soul met the Infinite and Eternal face to face, and heard the secrets of Jehovah's council directly from His own mouth." By this view Smith puts Isaiah precisely on a level with a pagan seer. We cannot, indeed, "in the highest imaginings of poetical genius, analyse the working of the prophet's soul in a supreme moment of converse with God." In this sceptical age we should regard the seer as a crazy fanatic. Revelation is believed to flow from dream, vision, voice, and intuition. Isaiah elevates high above all his predecessors the standard of Divine holiness. He sets a higher ideal of God and religion before his fellows.

"The peculiarities of Hebrew grammar and prophetic style often make it difficult to distinguish between narrative and prediction, and the difficulty is increased by the fact that predictions referring to the near future

were sometimes fulfilled before they were set forth in a book." Precisely so; confusion reigns supreme in this sphere of prediction, which, however, according to Smith, was only one element of the prophetic character. "Jehovah's righteousness is nothing else than kingly righteousness in the ordinary sense of the word, and its sphere is the sphere of His literal sovereignty—that is, the land of Israel." In point of fact, Jehovah is only a name to conjure with in the mouth of a national reformer, who preached the necessity "of the downfall of the corrupt rulers." Much nonsense is written about prophecy—but "the substance of Messianic prophecy is ideal, not literal; the business of the prophet is not to anticipate history, but to signalise the principles of divine grace which rule the future, because they are eternal as Jehovah's purpose." Hence, accordingly, "in all matters of difficult decision, the mouth of Jehovah was appealed to," through the visible instrumentality of the priest or prophet. We hear a deal of British-Israel; but Dr. Smith is decisive upon that delusion. The ten tribes relapsed into heathenism, and finally lost their distinctive characteristics.

Isaiah and his followers led people to see the possibility of religion apart from the state. The formation of this little community, during the Assyrian calamity, was a novelty. "It was the faith of a new era in the Old Testament religion; for it was the birth of the conception of the *Church*, the first step in the emancipation of spiritual religion from the forms of political life." Isaiah himself, during the Assyrian desolation, did not, perhaps, see "how deep was the breach between the physical Israel and the spiritual community of faith." But the Bible is clearly "the history of true religion, of the adoption and education of the Church from age to age in a scheme of gradual advance." This historical continuity of revelation is the grand theme of Robertson Smith's book. In place of trying "to find the law of this continuity by speculative and dogmatic methods," he applies himself to the same task by means of "ordinary historical investigation." Here in his book differs from Calvinistic theology. Micah is a democrat, Isaiah an aristocrat. "His doctrine of the indestructibility of Zion as the condition of the continuity of the national existence of Judah seems to indicate that the capital and the court appeared to him as the natural centre of the true remnant. Obedience to Jehovah as a king is not the affair of an individual conscience, but of the nation in its national organisation; the righteousness of Israel which Isaiah contemplates is such righteousness as is secured by a perfectly wise and firm application of civil justice and equity. Isaiah's ideal is only the perfect performance of the ordinary duties of monarchy." He had no idea of a future Messiah in the person of Christ.

The Hebrew State, says our author, "consisted essentially of two classes, the peasants and the governors or nobles. Husbandry on the one side, good government and justice on the other, are the twin pillars of the State, and for prince and peasant alike the knowledge of Jehovah means the knowledge of the duties of his vocation, as sacred rules enforced by divine sanction and blessed by divine grace. Well ordered and peaceful industry on the one hand, strict and impartial justice on the other, are the marks by which it is known that Jehovah's law is supreme in Israel. The king of Israel reigns in Jehovah's name. In him Jehovah's rule becomes visible in Israel, and His great four-fold name speaks rather of the Divine attributes that shine forth in his sovereignty, than of the transcendency of a person that is God as well as man. The prophet does not say that the king *is* the mighty God and the everlasting Father, but that His *name* is divine and eternal—that is, that the Divine might and everlasting Fatherhood of Jehovah are displaced in His rule." The prophet's religion is very practical. He does not "regard religion as a thing by itself, which ought, indeed, to influence daily life, but nevertheless occupies a separate place in our hearts and actions. For him that contrast of the natural and supernatural which narrows all the religion of the present, has no existence. He knows nothing of laws of nature, of an order of the world which can be separated even in thought from the constant personal activity of Jehovah. The natural life of Israel is, already, as thoroughly penetrated by the supernatural as any heavenly state can be. It is not in the future alone that the Holy One of Israel is to become a living member in the daily life of His people. To him who has eyes to see and ears to hear, the presence and voice of Jehovah are already manifested with absolute and unmistakable clearness. It requires no argument to rise from nature to nature's God; the workings of Jehovah are as palpable as those of an ordinary man. He made religion an inseparable part of common life."

Isaiah contended that "everything real is supernatural, and supernatural in the same degree. The miracles of history, and the providences of common life, bring Jehovah alike near to faith. His religion is the religion of the God without whose will not even a sparrow can fall upon the ground, the God whose greatness lies in His equal sovereignty in things small and great. The Bible knows nothing of that narrow definition of miracle which we have inherited from medieval metaphysics. A marvel or miracle is a work of Jehovah, directed to confound the religion of formalism, to teach men that Jehovah's rule is a real thing, and not a traditional convention to be acknowledged in formulas learned by rote." The deliverance of Judah from the grasp of Assyria made it manifest to Israel "that Jehovah reigns supreme, and that there is no help or salvation save in Him." All history is full of like proofs of divine sovereignty and grace, where, in ways incalculable, and through combinations that mocked the foresight and policy of human counsellors, God's cause has been proved indestructible, and the faith in a very present God and Saviour, which Isaiah preached, has come forth in new life from the wreck of societies in which religion had become a mere tradition of men. In this sense the age of miracle is not past. The

point of Isaiah's prophecy was not that the deliverance of Judah should take place in any one way, or with those dramatic circumstances of the so-called supernatural which a vulgar faith demands as the proof that God is at work." The religion of Isaiah is "a practical power in daily life, and not a mere precept of men, learned by rote." The restoration of the Jews, and the consequent greatness of Jerusalem, Robertson Smith regards as purely visionary. "Fanciful theorists, who use the Old Testament as a book of curious mysteries, and profane its grandeur by adapting it to their idle visions at the sacrifice of every law of sound hermeneutics and sober historical judgment, may still dream of future political conjunctions which shall restore to Palestine the position of central importance which it once held as the meeting-place of the lands of ancient civilisation; but no sane thinker can seriously imagine that Tyre will again become the emporium of the world's commerce, or Jerusalem the seat of universal sovereignty." The Millenarians are characterised as a species of fantastic theorists, "whose visions deserve no elaborate refutation?" Our author does not take much pains to conceal his personal scorn "of the figurative or allegorical school of exegesis." He reads the prophetic writings in their natural sense, and as little respects the *hidden sense* of mystics. The current allegorical exegesis "enables each man to prove his own dogmas at will from the Old Testament, and leaves us altogether uncertain what the prophets themselves believed, and what work they wrought for God in their own age. The general law of allegorical interpretation is, that everything which in its literal sense seems impossible, untrue, or unworthy of God, must be rescued from this condemnation by the hypothesis of a hidden sense, which was the real meaning of the inspiring Spirit, and even of the prophet himself, except in so far as he was a mere unintelligent machine in the hand of the revealer. It is certainly true that all early thought about abstract and transcendental ideas is largely carried by the aid of figure and analogy, and that general truths are apprehended and expressed in particular, and even accidental forms. But this is something very different from the doctrine of a spiritual sense in the traditional meaning of the word." The prophet, like the dramatist, deals with eternal truths. "The insight of the prophet, like that of the unprophetic dramatist, vindicates itself in the delineation of true motives—in the representation of the actual forces that rule the evolution of human affairs,—not in the exact reproduction of any one stage of past or future history." The prophet deals with spiritual certainties and eternal principles. "The true meaning of his words unfolds itself clearly enough as soon as we realise the historical surroundings of his ministry and the principles of spiritual faith; or, in other words, the conception of Jehovah and the laws of his working. The Kingship of Jehovah, the holy majesty of the one true God, the eternal validity of his law of righteousness, the certainty that His cause on earth is imperishable, and must triumph over all the wrath of man; that His word of grace cannot be without avail; and that the community of His grace is the one thing on earth that cannot be brought to nought. Everything else in his teaching is nothing more than an attempt to give these principles concrete shape and tangible form in relation to the problems of his own day."

Our author adopts a clearly rationalistic canon of historical criticism in dealing with the Bible. "When we learn to seek the true significance of the work of the prophets, not in the variable details of their predictions, but in the principles of faith which are common to all spiritual religion, and differ from the faith of the New Testament only as the unexpanded germ differs from the full growth; we see also that the complete proof of their divine mission can only be found in the efficacy of their work towards the maintenance and progressive growth of the community of spiritual faith." Isaiah and his party laboured zealously towards the reformation of religion, the abolition of idolatry, and the administration of equal justice to all classes and conditions of citizens. But the prophets did not fully apprehend the grand truth of the Gospel—to wit, that the effectual reformation and regeneration of corrupt society must proceed from the heart of every individual. It must come, not *ab extra*, but *ab intra*. Nevertheless, we can clearly see that the prophets gradually laid a basis "for a new development of spiritual truth which should carry the religion of Israel another stage towards its goal in the religion of Christ." Ritual worship is gradually on the wane. The prophets tell the people that Jehovah requires nothing of them but "to fear Jehovah thy Lord, to walk in all His ways, and to love and serve Him with all thy heart and all thy soul." The sum of true religion is clearly enunciated by Micah.—"He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth Jehovah require of thee, but to do judgment, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God." It must be a religion of the heart. The prophets dimly descried the catholic principle, "which no legal system could exhaust, and which never found full embodiment till the religion of the Old Testament passed into the religion of Christ." The prophetic thoughts of God's messengers "stretched far beyond the limits of the old dispensation, to days when Jehovah's precepts should be written on every heart." Religion, then, would be a living force, not a perfunctory or conventional ritual of formalism. There is a persistent unity of plan and purpose pervading the Books of the Old Testament, and steadily pointing at a higher ideal of religion, which culminates in the New Testament. Our author bounds, *per saltum*, at the most orthodox conclusion, that it is only "through the New Testament that we learn that a complete and adequate manifestation of God to man can only be made through a Godman." This is casting a sop to Cerberus with a vengeance. Our author has coiled round his own neck the cords of Rationalism and historical criticism. He stands on a plank of inspiration which the philosopher will eagerly upset by the same weapons of criticism; and

so our ex-professor shall be found floundering in the roaring billows and yawning whirlpools of scepticism, infidelity, and atheism. His book is a masterpiece of its kind, but when the masses of ignorant men shall be found repeating his shibboleth, and Scotland shall be drifting to infidelity, our author will perhaps be sorrowful, and ashamed of his followers. He has appealed unto Reason, and to Reason he must go. The bulk of mankind is incapable of exercising thoughtful reflection. The disciples of a great thinker generally make a travesty of the doctrines of their master. It is—as we have personally experienced—dangerous to cast the seeds of religious scepticism over the face of society. Socialism, anarchy, immorality, infidelity, and the coarsest forms of materialism invariably spring up from such seeds. The book, however, is learned and replete with the fruits of research. We are perfectly confident that there are not two men in the Southern Hemisphere of sufficient erudition and comprehension of intellect to give us a clear synopsis of his ideas, and a critical analysis of his arguments. This thoughtful conviction has constrained us to criticise the "Prophets of Israel."

The Religious Revolution of the Nineteenth Century.

Edgar Quinet—who for 60 years brooded over France, and for 50 years actually was her mentor—is an uncompromising foe to the Roman Church. His six-and-twenty volumes are all inspired with one idea. What Scipio said of Carthage, Quinet fulminates against Rome—*Censeo Roman esse delendam*. Civil liberty and Romanism are absolutely irreconcilable. He has all along preached this doctrine to his countrymen. "I would that the nations should come out in crowds from the old Church by the thousand doors which the modern religious spirit has opened up in the walls of Christendom." Quinet warns the nations, and predicts the issue of the battle—"Come out of the old Church, come out while there is yet time, before she has walled up the gate." Trade and manufactures cannot save Europe, while the public conscience is paralysed under the Papacy. According to Quinet, "the nineteenth century is enchained, stupified, drunk with materialism," and without "the pure spirit of Christianity and of Philosophy, it is sure to become an object of laughter to posterity." The French Revolution failed solely because it ignored all religion, and so forced "the entire world to coalesce against it." He advises his countrymen to "make use of every element opposed to Catholicism" with a view to its final overthrow. Quinet deprecates the damnable error that *all religions are the same*. Rome is the enemy of all religions, and her superstition is incompatible with modern liberty; therefore she must be summarily destroyed. She excludes modern civilization. She is "incompatible with modern liberty. This religion has institutions, organs, instruments of bondage, which the others do not possess, such, for example, as the Papacy and celibacy of the clergy, from the latter of which has been born a new form of caste thoroughly irreconcilable with the organization of our new society. There are other religions quite compatible with modern liberty, since they have given birth to it and are the means of preserving it. There are finally those that border on philosophic liberty, religions whose originators have been philosophers." The principle of Quinet is this—no political revolution is secure which has not, as in England, been preceded by a religious one. Italy is a case in point. The spiritual always overcomes the temporal. A radical religious reformation must precede a political revolution. Force, not education, must destroy a false religion. The State forcibly closed the pagan temples when Christianity attained the power to do so. *Mere education can never destroy a baneful religion*. You must tear off the mask. For, argues Quinet, "Give me the mask. With the mask alone I will make myself master of the individual man. The real education of a people is its religion; beside it all other teaching is as nothing." Knox knew this and he ruthlessly erased Romanism out of Scotland. Quinet asserts that "there has been no time or place in which the Catholic Church has been allowed to remain with unfettered hands by the cradle of liberty but what in a short time liberty has been found stifled in its swaddling clothes."

All the great reformers acted upon this principle of destruction, for, as Quinet justly says, "He who, possessing authority, undertakes to root up a worn-out and harmful superstition, ought, before all things, to remove the superstition itself from the eyes of the people, and to render its practice absolutely and materially impossible, destroying at the same time every hope of its revival." Thus acted the first Christian emperors, the Hebrew reformers, the medieval missionaries, and the Protestant reformers. "In its struggle with paganism, Catholic authority has itself given the world the most complete and radical method for annihilating an ancient religion." Before this "*System of law*, paganism vanished of itself; wherever these laws could not extend, paganism remained, and remains yet without alteration, as any one may see in the great religions of Oriental Asia." The revenues of the pagan temples were assigned to the soldiery, with the view of perfect destruction, "and often, in order utterly to pollute the temples, they were turned into places of prostitution." Interest, cupidity, and last, "were combined with the sovereign will of authority to despoil and ruin the pagan temples." Theodosius the Great decreed thus:—"Let all the temples, sanctuaries, if they still remain entire, be destroyed

by order of the magistrates, and purified by the cross; if any one contravenes this law, let him be punished with death." The same process of annihilation. Quinet would adopt in reference to the Roman Catholic religion, its worship, its sacrifices, its folly, its superstition. "Worn-out religions resemble those old trees that are nothing but bark." Cut them down at once. John Knox imitated the old church from which he seceded, in his iconoclastic dealings with popery and its temples. Libanius asked quarter for the stones of the temples, but his prayers were useless. "The most magnificent works of the hand of man, the most celebrated edifices in Greece, Italy Africa or Asia, are pulled down directly they are found in the way of the *ecclesiastical hand*. The hammer and the pick-axe resound throughout the empire. The legions *are sent against the stones*. If the political authority is for a moment idle, the councils demand that the work of destruction should be completed. That of Carthage denounces the edifices, the statues, the very trees. Out of the ruins of the temples arise churches." Quinet urges the French, and the nations of Europe at large, to apply this most Christian line of procedure to the Roman Catholic Church. Unless this is done, "we shall see the nineteenth century falling into a kind of dotage," under the baneful influences of the enemy of humanity, religion, and liberty. The enemies of liberty are wiser than her friends—"they all, by an infallible instinct, rally round the Roman Church as around their citadel." To France, and the Government of France in particular, Quinet says—"Take care! Antony will ruin you, you and yours, if you do not ruin Antony." Like his great master—who was *the genius of Dutch Protestantism incarnate*,—Edgar Quinet writes with "a veracity that knows no mercy, and gives no quarter. There is no double-dealing in him. If you like being deluded, you should avoid him. What he promises he performs. No one can read him to the end and believe any longer in Catholic dogma." Quinet, like Marnix—whose works, "well nigh buried under three centuries of persecution, neglect, and ingratitude," he has brought to light and digested—has laboured to demonstrate that *Catholicism is a new Paganism*. Wherefore, reasons this great French scholar, "that which the friend of William the Taciturn did with regard to its dogma, our age has done with regard to its politics; and for my part, I claim the honour of never having ceased a single day for forty years to show the radical and absolute incompatibility of the Roman Catholic religion with modern civilisation, with the enfranchisement of the nationalities, and with civil and political liberty." Until this institution be demolished—as *a final form of paganism* and "abandoned to the whistling and laughter of the winds; exposed in all its nakedness; a mythology restored and suddenly overturned; the scattered remains of another Diana of the Ephesians," there can be no liberty—civil or religious—in France. To Quinet's clear eye "two points are incontestable concerning this religion of the middle ages—falsehood in spiritual things, tyranny in temporal things." Therefore, Romanism must be finally destroyed, and then we shall see "the conscience of modern humanity courageously seeking, examining, and tracing out for itself a return to God and liberty through the gospel." The French Revolution was a huge failure. It began at the wrong end. It was atheistic in idea, and so miscarried. "The eyes of the most blind have been opened by the sight of a great people, who, after sixty years of efforts and sacrifices, in which so many gigantic works have been undertaken, and so many magnanimous combats fought out, still remain on the old foundations of the middle ages, condemned in consequence *never* to be able to found within itself, I do not say the perfect institutions, but even a single atom of durable liberty." Spoken as a philosopher. Quinet's portrait lies before me. It has the thoughtfulness of a Chalmers, but the severely intellectual austerity of a real philosopher. The physiognomy is well fitted to inspire reverential awe. The brow is lotty, and the lips firmly compressed. Decision is traced in the aspect of the face. This great writer has literally moulded the form of French thought. He died in 1875. "A complete edition of his works has been for some time past in course of publication in France as a national testimonial; the committee united for the purpose representing not only Paris, but fifty-eight departments of France. The twenty-sixth and last volume" appeared in 1881. France has decided to erect a statue in perpetual remembrance of this really great man. By public subscription, a sum of 20,000 francs was quickly realised. "Nearly every town in France with a population of more than 5000 responded" to the Committee's appeal. Germany highly values the genius of Quinet. Goethe introduced his first philosophical work to the notice of his countrymen, just as he had recommended our own Carlyle. Heine "declared that in his day there were not three poets in the world who possessed so much imagination, richness of ideas, and originality as Edgar Quinet." After reading his works, we cannot altogether endorse this very extravagant notion. Nevertheless, Quinet was a truly great man. His two leading ideas of philosophy were—"the principle of liberty, and the importance of the individual." No wonder he was the foe of the Papacy. He was a philosophical reformer. He was no sciolist, novice, tyro, or smatterer. As a whole-souled, full square man, he declared, in his "French Revolution," that its comparative failure was owing to those who made it not understanding the principal condition of its success. In not seeing that any political revolution, to be permanent, must be preceded by a religious one, they had acted just as a man who should think to clear his garden of weeds by cutting them all down with a scythe. The religion of a nation is the root of all its life, and of every one of its institutions; and if you fail to change that, your political efforts, however sweeping, will have to be repeated. And has not this been the fate of France? The Revolution ran its course, and in a very few years the old crop began to appear again, the old institutions, old methods of ruling.

The mower put in the revolutionary scythe, and the revived medievalism of the Restoration was cut down in the neatest manner. The scythe was hardly dry before the young shoots began to spring again, and eighteen years after the process had to be repeated with even more thoroughness. But all to no effect, for a crop richer and ranker than ever began to arise." The English "revolution was more radical" than the French, and hence its beneficial consequences. To expect liberty under the shadow of Romanism is as reasonable as to expect grapes from thorns or figs from thistles. "The Jesuits conceived and carried out the counter-reformation; their successors have now conceived and are preparing the way for the counter-revolution." The moral welfare of the nation imperatively demands the legal suppression of Romanism. Quinet, Michelet, &c., fought for the substance of liberty against Montalembert, &c., who prated about the shadow and abstract notion of liberty. The law of self-protection calls for the destruction of the foe of liberty. The Ethiopian cannot change his skin, nor the leopard his spots. Romanism claims "absolute dominion over the consciences of men." By this arrogant attitude it "clearly places itself outside the right of Religious Liberty; and it is against this Institution the modern State has to fight or to fall." The present temper of the French nation is highly favourable to Quinet's idea. "Facts upon facts could be heaped up to prove the existence of an hostility to the Church which may fairly be called National." According to the published testimony of the Abbe Baugaud, Vicar general of the diocese of Orleans, "Out of the 87 dioceses into which France is divided, only 27 have a sufficient number of priests; 21 want from 15 to 30; and thirty from 90 to more than 100." The pamphlet draws its inspiration and information from the bishops, and its author received the thanks of Cardinal Nina, the Papal Secretary of State. In 1877, 2,568 parishes wanted priests.