

one week, each disputant to frame his own propositions so that they shall express his true position; each to affirm half the time; each to choose the propositions he will affirm, and I will make no objections to meet Braden at Meaford, if "the friends of the Bible" there put him forward as an endorsed representative.

Certain statements have been made by myself and by others touching Braden's character and conduct, and these statements, as published in the Meaford papers, including the articles copied from the FREETHOUGHT JOURNAL, I know to be true. But they have not been presented as a reason why I should not meet Braden at Meaford. Braden, unable apparently to restrain his propensity to slander, and to falsify, simply to explain what he knew was a very "unsatisfactory" date to the Christians of Denver, represented at Meaford that in the debate alluded to I descended to blackguardism, and that the audience was composed of an ignorant and low-lived class to whose tastes I pandored. This slanderous statement (which has been completely refuted by the testimony of two of the moderators, including Governor King, Braden's own moderator, and by the statements of others, who sided with Braden in the debate) and other representations equally false, led me to vindicate myself, and in doing it I was obliged to show the falsity of Braden's assertions and his want of principle. If I have made any statements that are untrue let him attempt to refute them.

I know he has been guilty of falsehood and of slander. I know that the charge, concerning which his friends at Meaford know not what to think in view of the boldness with which it has been made, and his own silence, viz., that he has furnished a Freethought lecturer with information regarding the strong and weak points of a brother minister with a view to helping him defeat said brother in debate, the person concerning whom the information was given being no other person than Elder John Sweeney, against whom he had some grudge. I know this charge to be true. If it is not true the editor of the FREETHOUGHT JOURNAL and myself can be prosecuted by Braden for libel. Notwithstanding these facts and others quite as damaging to Braden as a man, if the Christians of Meaford endorse him as a Christian and a worthy representative of Christianity, as my friends there endorse me as a Freethinker and a representative of Freethought, I am ready to meet him there on reasonable conditions, as I have in other places the last few years.

Passing by Braden's coarse abuse (which he exposes in such words as "bushwhacking and gorilla dirt flinging," "cowardly and sneaking works," "dirt and slander," "Infidel lackeys," &c.) I respectfully submit the above statement to the people of Meaford in justification of the course that I and my friends have taken, and the position we now occupy, in regard to a debate at that place.

Respectfully,

B. F. UNDERWOOD.

Newport, R. I., Aug. 27, 1878.

On looking over Braden's communication the second time I am induced to add the following to my reply:

Although since I have not urged anything pertaining to Braden's character as a reason for not meeting him in debate at Meaford, and will not therefore spend money and lose time to visit that place merely to appear before a committee, as the condition of a debate, yet if Braden or his supporters think he is in need of being investigated I will present for his consideration publicly, and place in the possession of a committee to be appointed by him and myself, the evidences of the following charges.

1. That Braden made false and slanderous statements regarding me in connection with the Denver debate.

2. That according to verbal statements and a written statement of E. F. Biens a prominent member of the Christian Church of Tine, Ill., and a citizen respected for his integrity and worth, Braden, after a debate with me at Washington, Ill., went to a distant town of the State and represented that on the last evening of the debate I was intoxicated, and in consequence thereof failed in my closing speech.

3. That Braden afterwards in a letter declared he knew I was under the influence of liquor, and in proof of his statement appealed to or referred to an individual who positively denied it, and testified to the contrary.

4. That Braden afterwards confessed he was mistaken and apologized to me for what he had said, and promised to make a retraction through the papers of his denomination.

This promise was verbal and I have no written evidence of it, but I have his statement that he was mistaken, and I solemnly affirm that he promised to make the retraction as stated.

5. That instead of stating in his denominational papers that he had made misstatements regarding me, he published a card, saying I had retracted what I had said about him, when I had made no misstatement respecting him, and had retracted nothing.

6. That Braden once wrote to a Freethought lecturer, proposing to unite their efforts in a way that should secure to each, \$100 and expenses per week.

7. That Braden wrote a Freethought lecturer, giving him information in regard to Elder John Sweeney, that he, the Freethought lecturer might avail himself of this information, and triumphantly defeat Elder Sweeney, with whom at that time he expected to debate.

I know that every one of the above statements are true, and I am willing to submit them, with the proofs of their truthfulness, to a committee; the only condition being that the committee, after examining the evidence, shall state to the public whether the accusations are true or false, Braden having the liberty to make a statement if the accusations are sustained by the committee, and I to publish the testimony and evidence (if I desire to) if the report leaves a doubt in regard to the truth of any of the above charges, or other charges I may make, if the committee is appointed.

This investigation is not requested by me, nor on my part is it the condition of a debate; but if Braden dares to bring the above charges and feels in need of vindication, I will help his friends to get at the truth to the best of my ability.

B. F. UNDERWOOD.

### THE CREED OF CHRISTENDOM.\*

For more than 300 years professing Christians of every shade of dissent have triumphantly boasted of the glorious privilege of an open Bible, and the rights of private judgment, but, strange to say, the innocence in differences of opinion has not received that recognition which the principles of the individual rights of judgment involve. At all times, and in all places, criticism has been suspected, and investigation into the divine claims of the Bible resented as sinful; but the odium which has attached itself to any doubt regarding the dominant religion, and the discouragement by all churches of a critical examination of the title deeds of Christianity, has not prevented searching and intelligent inquiry, which, of late years, has become too strong for repression. The work under notice has met an universal want. No other book in the English language on Historical Science and Biblical Criticism is so thorough, clear and comprehensive so concise and suggestive. It is bold but not irreverent, cautious but candid, and breathes throughout its entire pages a devotional spirit. Its value to the scholar and general reader is, that it embraces all the questions in conflict between dogmatic evangelical theology and extreme rationalism, and has what no other edition possesses, a very full and accurate index.

The introduction (of over 70 pages) reviews somewhat elaborately works on the same and kindred subjects issued since the first edition printed, about twenty-five years ago. Colenso on the "Pontatouch," Prof. Seeley's "Ecco Homo," Renan's "Life of Jesus," Judge Hanson's "Jesus of History," Strauss' "Life of Jesus," Matthew Arnold's "Literature and Dogma," etc., etc., are

\* "The Creed of Christendom; Its Foundation and Superstructure," by W. Rathbone Greg. Rose-Belford Publishing Co., Toronto; for sale at this office; \$1.50.