

APRIL, 1900.

# THE DOMINION REVIEW.

A Monthly Journal of Science, Religion, and Politics.

J. SPENCER ELLIS, EDITOR.

C. M. ELLIS, BUSINESS MGR.

## Contents.

Progress or Retrogression?.....	73	Christian Revolutions.....	Charles Watts	85
Hell Among the Presbyterians and Catholics .....	73	"Vengeance is Mine; I Will Repay!" saith the Lord.		
"How can the Churches be made Familiar and Serviceable to the People?" .....	74	"Church Standard" (Phil.)		87
The World-Enigma: Reply of the Nineteenth Century.		The Pagan Questioning Death. Poem.....	Anon.	88
Prof. Ernst Haeckel	77	A Corpse Transmogrified.....	M. C. O'Byrne	88
The French Revolution .....	Frederic May Holland	Ingersoll's Influence .....	Mary J. Lang, F.T.S.	89
The War Cloud and the Silver Lining.....	C. T. Gorham	Bicycles and Churches .....	M. C. O'Byrne	91
	84	Piety Up to Date.....	Saladin	92

LIBRARY OF



LIBRARY OF



LIBRARY OF



**Force and Matter; OR PRINCIPLES OF THE NATURAL ORDER OF THE UNIVERSE, with a System of Morality based thereon.** By Prof. Ludwig Büchner, M. D. A scientific and rationalistic work of great merit and value. Translated from the 15th German edition, revised and enlarged by the author, and reprinted from the fourth English edition. One volume, crown 8vo, 414 pp., with portrait. Extra silk cloth, \$1.00; half calf, \$3.00.

"Büchner's volume is so powerful an exposition of the thorough-going scientific theory of the universe that it may be confidently recommended to all who wish to become acquainted with present-day Materialism. The earlier chapters, dealing with the nature and indestructibility of force and matter, are sufficiently trenchant to arouse curiosity, while the facts adduced to prove the affinity of matter to life, as well as the scientific hypothesis than ever the difficulty of holding a vitalistic hypothesis. The unbiased reader will sympathize with Büchner's protest against the degrading conceptions of matter which are so common, as well as against the incoherent habit of implying an accordance which does not exist between matter and force, matter and spirit, body and soul. Natural laws are everywhere the same, the properties of matter are everywhere alike; wherever we find evidence of outside government or intervention. After treating of the successive periods of the life of man on the earth and the development of life, Büchner gives the fitness of things in nature is explained from the point of view of science, while the latter half of the book is occupied with an examination of the various phenomena of mind, consciousness, and soul, and the probabilities of their continued existence after death. The final chapter, on morality, treats the problem of human relations on the evolutionary line, which Mr. Spencer has rendered familiar."—*The Literary Guide, London.*

**Goodloe's Birth of the Republic.** Compiled from the National and Colonial Histories and Historical Collections, from the American Archives, from Memoirs and from the Journals and Proceedings of the British Parliament. Containing the Resolutions, Declarations and Addresses adopted by the Continental Congress, the Provincial Congresses, Conventions and Assemblies, of the Colonies and Town Meetings, and the Committees of Safety, in all the Colonies, from the year 1765 to 1779, to which is added the Articles of Confederation, a history of the formation and adoption of the Constitution, the election of President Washington, his Inauguration, April 30, 1789, a copy of the Constitution, and Washington's Inaugural Speech, 12mo, 400 pp. Cloth, \$1.00.

**Haeckel (Ernst.) Visit to CEYLON.** With Portrait, and Map of India and Ceylon. "These Letters constitute one of the most charming books of travel ever published, and quite worthy of being placed by the side of Darwin's 'Journey of the Beagle.'" Post, 8vo, 348 pp. Cloth, \$1.00.

**History of Christianity.** Comprising all that relates to Christian religion in *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, and also, a Vindication never before published in this country of "some passages in the fifteenth and sixteenth chapters," by Edward Gibbon, Esq. With a Preface, Life of the Author, and Notes by Peter Eckler; also, various Notes by Guizot, Wenck, Millman, "An English Churchman," and other scholars. This important work contains Gibbon's complete *Theological* writings, separate from his historical and miscellaneous works, showing when, where and how Christianity originated; who were its founders; and what were the sentiments, character, manners, numbers and condition of the primitive Christians." One vol., post 8vo, 864 pp., with Portrait of Gibbon and numerous Engravings of theological divinities. Extra silk cloth, gilt top, \$2.00. Half calf, \$4.00.

**History of a False Religion (BULWER) AND ORIGIN OF EVIL (BROUGHAM).** Preface by Peter Eckler. Paper, 25c.; cloth, 50c.

**Higgins' Horae Sabbaticae;** Or an Attempt to Correct Certain Superstitions and Vulgar Errors Respecting; the Sabbath. Preface by Peter Eckler. Crown 8vo, Paper, 25c.; cloth, 50c.

**Life of Jesus.** By ERNEST RENAN, with many valuable illustrations. 400 pp., crown 8vo, paper, 50c.; cloth, 75 cents.



Although educated as a Catholic priest, Renan, from study and observation, became a philosopher. From his religious training he had learned to admire and respect the character and teaching of Jesus of Nazareth, but his good sense and reason led him to disbelieve in the supernatural origin of the "Son of Mary." His reasons for this disbelief—

this want of faith—are as follows, and are given in his own words:

"None of the miracles with which the old histories are filled took place under scientific conditions. Observation, which has never once been falsified, teaches us that miracles never happen but in times and countries in which they are believed, and before physicians disposed to believe them. No miracle ever occurred in the presence of men capable of testing its miraculous character. Neither common people nor men of the world are able to do this. It requires great presence of mind and habits of scientific research. In our days, have we not seen almost all respectable people desert of the masses of fools or people illusions? Marvellous facts, attested by a whole population of small towns, have, thanks to a few sceptical travellers, been exploded. If it is proved that no contemporary miracle will bear inquiry, is it not probable that the miracles of the past, which have all been performed in popular gatherings, would equally present this shape of illusion, if it were possible to criticise them in detail?"

**Man in the Past, Present AND FUTURE.** By Prof. Ludwig Büchner. It describes Man as "a being not put upon the earth accidentally by an arbitrary act, but produced in harmony with the earth's nature, and belonging to it as do the flowers and fruits to the tree which bears them." Cloth, \$1.00.

**Mahomet, the Illustrious.** By Godfrey Higgins, Esq. Perhaps no author has appeared who was better qualified for writing an honest *Life of Mahomet—The Illustrious—* than Godfrey Higgins, Esq., the author of the present work. His knowledge of the Oriental languages, his careful and methodical examination of all known authorities—his evident desire to state the exact truth, joined to the judicial character of his mind, eminently fitted him for the task, and he has produced a work that will prove of interest to both Mahometans and Christians. Preface by Peter Eckler. Crown 8vo, paper, 25c.; cloth, 50c.

**Mahomet: His Birth, Character AND DOCTRINE.** By Edward Gibbon, Esq. Gibbon's account of the Arabian legislator and prophet, is conceded to be historically correct in every particular, and so grand and perfect in every detail as to be practically beyond the reach of adverse criticism. Crown 8vo, paper, 25c.; cloth, 50c.

**Meslier's Superstition in All AGES.** Jean Meslier was a Roman Catholic Priest who, after a pastoral service of thirty years in France, wholly abjured religious dogmas, and left this work as his last Will and Testament to his parishioners and to the world. Preface by Peter Eckler. 332 pp., portrait. Crown 8vo, paper, 50c.; cloth, \$1.00; half calf, \$3.00. The same work in German. Paper, 50c.; cloth, \$1.00.

**Profession of Faith of the VICAR OF SAVOY.** By J. J. Rousseau. Also, A SEARCH FOR TRUTH, by Olive Schreiner. Preface by Peter Eckler. Post 8vo, 128 pages, with portrait. Paper, 25c.; cloth, 50c.

**Philosophy of Disenchantment.** By E. E. Saltus. 233 pp., cloth, 75c.

**Reasons for Unbelief.** by Louis Viardot. Translated from the French. This volume is an analysis, an abstract, an epitome of the reasons given by the greatest writers of all ages for disbelief in supernatural religions. The arguments are clear, concise, convincing and conclusive. They are founded on reason and science, and rise to the dignity of demonstrations. The book will prove a priceless treasure to all enquiring minds. Paper, 25c.; cloth, 50c. "It is a good book, and will do good."—Robert G. Ingersoll.

**Rochefoucauld's Moral MAXIMS.** Containing 541 Maxims and Moral Sentences, by Francis, Duke of Rochefoucauld; together with 144 Maxims and Reflections by Stanislas, King of Poland. Also Maxims to live by, and Traits of Moral Courage in every-day life. 12mo, 186 pages. cloth, 75c. As Rochefoucauld his maxims drew From Nature,—I believe them true. They argue no corrupted mind. In him—the fault is in mankind!—Swift.

**Saltus' Anatomy of Negation.** Intended to convey a tableau of anti-theism from Kapila to Leconte de Lisle. The anti-theistic tendencies of England and America having been fully treated by other writers.

- The following subjects are fully discussed:
1. *The Revolt of the Orient*, Kapila—The Buddha—Laot-se, 2. *The Negations of Asceticism, Theomachy—Skeptichism—Epicurism—Atheism*, 3. *The Conventions of the Church*, Galilee—Rome, 4. *The Dissent of the Spirit*, Spinoza—The Seven Sages of Potsdam—Hilobach and his Guests, 5. *The Protests of Yesterday*, Akrismism—Pessimism—Materialism—Positivism, 6. *A Poet's Verdict*, Romanists and Parnassians. Bibliography, 12mo, 218 pp. Cloth, 75c.

**Shakespeare Portrayed by HIMSELF.** A Revelation of the Poet in the Career and Character of one of his own Dramatic Heroes. By Robert Waters, 1 vol., 12mo, cloth extra, \$1.25.

In this able and interesting work on Shakespeare, the author shows conclusively how our great poet revealed himself, his life, and his character. It is written in good and clear language, exceedingly interesting and is altogether the best popular life of Shakespeare that has yet appeared.

**Social Contract; OR PRINCIPLES OF POLITICAL LAW.** Also, A Project for a Perpetual Peace. By J. J. Rousseau, 1 vol., post 8vo, with portrait. Paper, 25c.; cloth, 50c. Paper, 50c.; extra silk cloth, 75c.

**Talleyrand's Letter to Pope PIUS VII.** With a Memoir and Portrait of the Author, his Famous Maxims, and also an account of his Celebrated Visit to Voltaire. Preface and Notes by Peter Eckler. 126 pp., paper, 25c.; cloth, 50c.

Address all orders to  
C. M. ELLIS,  
Secular • Thought • Office,  
185½ QUEEN STREET, West,  
Toronto, Can.

Address all orders to  
C. M. ELLIS,  
Secular • Thought • Office,  
185½ QUEEN STREET, West,  
Toronto, Can.

Address all orders to  
C. M. ELLIS,  
Secular • Thought • Office,  
185½ QUEEN STREET, West,  
Toronto, Can.

# THE DOMINION REVIEW.

J. SPENCER ELLIS - - EDITOR.

VOL. V., No. 4.

TORONTO, CAN., APRIL, 1900.

\$1 per year; 10c. per copy.

## NOTES AND COMMENTS.

### Progress or Retrogression?

It is extremely gratifying to us sometimes to note the signs of liberal progress that often manifest themselves. Certainly, on the whole, one cannot but admit that the world of thought and rational inquiry has wonderfully enlarged since the Modern Savior, the Printing Press, has brought down to the level of the masses the means of acquiring knowledge that formerly were only within the reach of the wealthy classes. But the question confronts us to-day, in the field of Rationalism, just as it does the missionary in the field of Religion, Have not the forces opposed to us made even greater progress than have those that are in our favor? The great cities of the world show some striking facts in this line of thought. The churches of the British metropolis can show substantial gains since, early in the century, the population of London numbered but a million and a half; but to-day its population amounts to nearly six millions, and comparatively the churches have gone back nearly fifty per cent. The same thing is true of New York, Chicago, and nearly every large city in Christendom. We may say with truth, that three-fourths of the people of these cities are practically pagans, who never see the inside of a church, and know nothing whatever of the theological subtleties that give mental pabulum and spiritual excitement to so many of their fellows. The question forces itself on us, Are these practical pagans any nearer true Rationalism than the more active-minded religionists? We are inclined to think that the mental indolence that leads them to leave all active work to men with more brain-energy than themselves, is a worse factor to deal with than the activity of the religious bigot. We may imagine that, because people do not go to church, they are mentally free, but this is only an assumption; the real fact being, we believe, that the vast mass of the people are so densely ignorant that they not only have no opinions of their own, either on religious or political subjects, but that they are liable to have their passions excited at a moment's notice by the loud-mouthed sectarians in either field. The schoolmaster, indeed, has hardly yet got his sword sharpened for attacking the giant Ignorance that stands in his path; and until he is able to deal some effective blows, the masses must necessarily be victimized by the false ideas that have hitherto enslaved them. They probably have heard a few rumbling sounds from the distant battle-field, but to us it is evident that the only men who are likely to understand the meaning of the struggle, or to reap the full advantage of it, are those who take an active share

in it. The rest are dummies, who certainly in the long run may accept the benefits conferred upon them by the work and sacrifice of others, but who in the meantime neither appreciate that work and sacrifice, nor are willing to help it by even the slightest effort.

### Hell Among the Presbyterians and Catholics.

A curious question crops up in this connection as to how far the modern ideas have penetrated the masses of the Catholic Church. Undoubtedly they must have done so to produce such cases as those of Mr. McCabe and the late Prof. St. George Mivart. But the bulk of the laity are evidently as pious and densely superstitious as ever, and it is probable that for every man who leaves the Roman Catholic Church for Rationalism a hundred are added to her ranks. The Catholic population of England has increased immensely during the past half-century; and Canada and the United States are not far behind in the reckoning. The eastern townships of our own province of Ontario, at one time mainly Scotch, are now largely French Catholic, two or three almost wholly so. It may be thought that the faith of the Catholic laity is being undermined, but there is not much evidence in favor of such an idea. The Catholic papers we see point very solidly to a different conclusion. There are probably as many atheists among the Catholic priesthood as there ever were, and as many irreligious indifferents among the laity; but it is clear that the faith of the mass, and their servile obedience to the hierarchy, are not at all disturbed. Some people profess to believe that "the bottom has been knocked out of hell;" but, though hell was supposed to be bottomless, and consequently non-existent, it is a fact that not only Catholics, but a large majority of Protestants, still believe in a physical hell of fire and brimstone. The very best and most learned men in the Presbyterian Church object to the doctrine of Infant Damnation because of the evident cruelty and injustice of consigning innocent infants to eternal torments; but where is the sense of such an objection if there is no place for the infliction of eternal torture? It is abundantly clear that the humane and pious Presbyterians fully believe in the existence of hell and in the justice of eternal torture for adults, or they would see the stupidity of objecting to infant punishment. That the Catholics fully believe in hell-fire, and that the priests make a big revenue out of the laity's fear of it, are unquestionable facts. People would not pay for masses for the dead if they did not believe there was a hell which the masses would save their friends from falling into. Here is a placard which appears on a board in a prominent place in the Cemetery of Cote des Neiges, Montreal, the leading city of the Dominion.

The post carrying the placard surmounts an iron box for the reception of contributions. We copy it from *La Petite Revue*, a French semi-monthly magazine, which pretty freely discusses ecclesiastical and political questions from a French-Canadian standpoint:

**AH ! QUE JE SOUFFRE DANS CES  
FLAMMES !... ET VOUS M'OUBLIEZ.**

AYEZ PITIÉ DE MOI ! AYEZ PITIÉ DE MOI !  
VOUS AU MOINS QUI ÊTES MES PARENTS  
ET MES AMIS.

Chaque année, au mois de novembre, un service sera chanté à l'église Notre Dame pour les âmes des fidèles inhumés dans ce cimetière et selon les intentions des personnes qui y auront contribué.

Translated freely into English this would read: "Oh, what am I suffering in these flames!.... and you forget me! Have pity upon me! you at least who are my relatives and my friends! Every year, in the month of November, a service will be chanted in the Church of Notre Dame for the souls of the faithful buried in this cemetery, and according to the intentions of those who may have contributed to it." As there seems to be no provision made for recording the intentions of donors to this pious fake, it will be seen that, excepting in cases where written communications may be deposited with the cash, the relatives and friends of the poor burning victims must depend upon some sort of telepathic communication with the priests or upon the good memory of the occupant of the Great White Throne. One point that seems puzzling to us is the statement that the poor sufferers in the flames are of the "faithful." Surely it is poor encouragement to the living faithful to be told that their faithful relatives and friends are suffering as much punishment as the wicked atheists and Protestants. Possibly, however, there may be degrees of heat under the purgatorial gridiron, and, just as the cold winter blast is tempered to the shorn lamb, so a comparatively cool corner may be reserved for those who have friends able to drop a coin into the slot of the iron box. We give it up. *La Petite Revue* comments thus upon the placard:

"It results from this—

"1. That the souls of the dead buried elsewhere have no right to this precious annual intercession;

"2. That the souls of the dead buried in the cemetery of the Cote des Niegues have a right to the benefits of this intercession, but only when a friend has slipped a piece of money with this purpose in the slot of the box.

"Without this little formality, very simple and very easy to perform, the souls that suffer the fires of purgatory must remain there until the divine anger shall be appeased with a crown, with a half-crown, or even with a poor little five cent piece!"

"This inscription and appeal constitute a manoeuvre which some harsh people, in certain places, would call a swindle. We do not go as far as that, but we see in it a blasphemy—that is to say, a direct insult to the good God.

"In effect, do they give us to understand that he shows himself clement and merciful only to those who purchase his mercy and his clemency?

"No one would dare to make a similar insinuation against even the most partial of our human judges, but when it is a question of the good God, they are less scrupulous and much less afraid, and do not hesitate to represent him as a dealer in favors and as a prevaricator."

In its last sentence *La Petite Revue* hits the nail fairly on the head. The priests attribute actions and motives

to their "god" that would make a Hindu Thug feel mean, and make out of their poor victims profits that a Shylock would not touch. But the subject deals with matters that are so far away, have such a remote connection with the daily struggle for bread and butter, that the mass of people assume a quite different mental attitude towards them from that which they take up regarding the practical affairs of human life. Business men who would not for a moment depend upon a preacher's judgment in regard to a railway journey, will pay hundreds of dollars per year for the same preacher's advice as to the best way of getting to heaven. We join our contemporary in calling this iron-box collection a rank swindle, and we can well understand the leer that must stamp itself on the face of the priest who occasionally opens the iron box and collects the gifts of the victims. The fact, however, shows conclusively that the belief in hell is still a living factor among the Catholic majority of the Canadian people as well as among Protestants, and a paying asset of the Church.

We should not forget that it is the same spirit which consigns men to hell-fire after death as that which led men to burn their fellows at the stake. The terrible scenes witnessed during the last few years in the States, where men have been burnt alive by mobs without trial or on mere suspicion, have shown that the spirit of racial and sectarian jealousy and hatred that in past ages converted men into fiends, is by no means extinct. Given, indeed, the opportunity—let the priests acquire the power at which they are aiming—and the simple-minded people who piously drop their coins into the iron box to save the souls of their dead friends from purgatorial fires, are just those who would support the priests in punishing, if not with stake and faggot, at least with imprisonment and disabilities, their religious opponents. Perhaps our best hope is that the almost equally bigoted and superstitious Protestants, though they may just at present be playing into the hands of the Romanists by struggling for State aid to their denominational schools, may find that their ultimate salvation from the tyranny of the Romish hierarchy lies in their taking sides with the Liberals, and demanding a real separation of Church and State—a complete secularization of all State affairs—instead of the partial connection that now exists. It is astonishing that Protestants cannot see that they are really selling themselves when they attempt to secure State aid for their different schools and schemes, and that for every advantage they gain the Catholics will secure more than an equivalent.

### "How can the Churches be made Familiar and Serviceable to the People?"

This was the subject of a discussion held a few weeks ago in New York, among principally a few prominent preachers, which turned mainly upon some remarks made on the declining influence of the Church by Comptroller Bird S. Coler, who had said:

It is a waste of money to build churches costing hundreds of thousands of dollars, and then use them only once or twice a week.

These immense auditoriums that we now own should be thrown open for educational as well as religious teachings.

I believe that the masses of the people in our great cities are away from the churches simply because the churches are away from them.

There should be libraries connected with every church, and certain educational work should be started in all of them where none is in progress now either in the church proper or in the lecture-room

Our churches should take up vigorously the question of good citizenship. When you make a man a good citizen you have him half way into the church.

The discussion was as follows:

THE REV. W. S. RAINSFORD—I agree with Comptroller Coler, but would put the first statement more strongly. There could be no stronger proof of how out of touch with the people the churches are than the fact that their great structures are closed six days out of seven. That sort of church is doomed.

COMMANDER BALLINGTON BOOTH—That is so. There are sufficient church buildings in New York to reach and reclaim not only all of the unchurched, among the wealthy, but also in the lower walks of society, with the right tactics and methods used in connection with them.

COMMISSIONER JOHN W. KELLER—What would you propose doing?

THE REV. S. P. CADMAN—The answer to that is simple. Let the churches be open all the time to all the people. Give them light amusement as well as religious food; give them lectures on current topics as well as on theology; make the churches social meeting places.

COMMISSIONER KELLER—But you cannot make the church a place of amusement and preserve it as a church, can you?

BALLINGTON BOOTH—Leaving amusement aside, is there any reason why our church edifices should be wasted? There is sufficient lay talent in every church to conduct some sort of service every day. I have never found in the Old Testament any account of a temple that was not always open to the people.

DR. RAINSFORD—Experience teaches that through amusement and non-religious meetings provided by church societies the churches reach the people. A very large proportion of St. George's increase in membership comes through the church-house, in which we have a large gymnasium, working-girls' and working men's meetings and many dances, often two and sometimes three a week.

COMMISSIONER KELLER—There are always some people who want to make churches out of the theatres. They are no more right than those who seek to make theatres out of the churches. While it may seem reasonable that some sort of entertainment be given in a special room or church house, I reiterate that the church building itself is a spiritual place and in order to preserve the proper spirit in it we must remove it from carnal environment.

DR. RAINSFORD—The world has progressed. The alienation of the people from the churches is much deeper than Mr. Coler suggests. What the church used to stand for men now obtain in a great variety of ways. Not many years ago the public had to depend largely upon the weekly sermon for their intellectual food. Now they get it through numerous channels of life, through the newspapers, the magazines, lectures and otherwise. To lead them to the higher benefits of religious influence we must interest them in the way I suggested before.

DR. CADMAN—I agree with Dr. Rainsford, and will give some figures which may convince Mr. Keller. When I took charge of the Central Metropolitan Temple five years ago it was a pew-owners' church, kept for a select few. It had an average attendance of thirty or forty and a membership of one hundred. I made it an open church in the broadest sense of that term. It is open all day to any one, and every evening there is an entertainment of some sort in the church auditorium. These entertainments range from talks to the people on timely subjects to stereopticon lectures and musical entertainments. Now we have a membership of 1,300 and an attendance of the same number.

COMMISSIONER KELLER—I still contend that the church is to me a temple and I think it should be kept as such. Do you think the average man would go to church week nights if it were open to him and he were invited?

DR. CADMAN—As to your first statement I would say that I never have a meeting in my church which could not fittingly be opened and closed with prayer. Again, figures prove that

pe ple w'l go to churches on week nights. In my church and parish we have eighty-five services a week, with an average attendance of 10,000. Last year 700 persons professed conversion and 300 members were added to the church. This work has rejuvenated churches all over the neighborhood, and I am glad to know that it is an exact model of the Comptroller's idea.

BALLINGTON BOOTH—There is need of more such work. The very fact that we have only 23,000,000 nominal church members in this country proves it. If the halls of the Volunteers of America were open only one day a week, like a majority of the churches, we could not begin to show the net results we do now. I would like to add, too, that I deplore with increasing regret the tendency to remove churches to wealthier and more aristocratic neighborhoods, often leaving the unministered and the ungospelized without a church.

COMMISSIONER KELLER—People need not worry about the working, self-respecting poor. The man who works for his daily bread is quite able to take care of himself and does not need any self-appointed guardian to look after him. As for amusement in churches, if he wants entertainment he will get it in a way that will not do himself or anybody else harm if he is a good man, and such men usually are. In all matters of morality and decency my experience with the poor of New York is that they are on a high plane and are fully capable of taking care of themselves.

BALLINGTON BOOTH—But you realize as fully as any of us that these people must be ministered to. I do not think that the poorer or lower elements of society will ever be reached by what I may term a fantastic, distant, or patronizing manner. Silk hats, kid gloves, jewels and evening dress will have to go, and the worker who is the Samaritan will have to come to these people on their own level. Opening the church buildings about them and making them feel always at home in them will be an important step.

THE REV. B. F. DE COSTA—It seems to me that Mr. Coler knows nothing to speak of about the church. His first statement is quite true, and sensible churchmen hardly need the information he offers; but that the churches are away from the people is to be explained by the fact that the people are away from them—away through misconception, through indifference and owing to the fact also that hard social conditions give no time for them to draw near.

J. B. REYNOLDS—I certainly believe that more use should be got out of our church buildings, and as a practical suggestion would like to ask why they should not be opened to labor unions as places for holding their meetings?

DR. RAINSFORD—Most church auditoriums are not adapted to conventions and such meetings. The average speaker cannot be heard in them. But it certainly would be a good thing for the churches to invite trades unions to use their lecture-rooms or rooms in their parish-houses.

MR. REYNOLDS—Nine-tenths of the labor-unions are now subjected to bad influences because they are compelled to hold meetings in rooms adjacent to saloons. The rental they pay is nominal, but members are supposed to spend a certain amount at the bar, and what goes for drink actually makes the rent very high. The churches might provide meeting-places for them free.

BALLINGTON BOOTH—Would they go to the churches?

MR. REYNOLDS—That would depend on how the churches extended their offer. If the unions were left free-handed and the church did not interfere in any way, yes.

DR. RAINSFORD—I have this winter tried the experiment of having prominent speakers lecture to working men in my church. Every man who has given evidence of a desire to serve the community and uphold the truth should, in my judgment, be gladly accorded a hearing in a church of Jesus Christ. Church auditoriums could well be used for musical entertainments. Good music will fill churches. Then if a man who understands how should get up and speak for a quarter of an hour, the audience would like it better than the music.

MR. REYNOLDS—Another thing I would like to point out is the need of halls for the use of young people of the poorer class for social gatherings. Outside of the halls of the Educational Alliance and of the University Settlement, there is not a social hall on the lower east side which can be hired for such purposes that has not a bar connected with it. The churches could overcome this difficulty by providing halls in which these young people might dance. I should be in favor of church dance-halls.

DR. DE COSTA—You would degrade yourselves simply to fill your house.

MR. REYNOLDS—In the University Settlement Building there is a hall for dancing. Not only are there no evil results from these dances, but many young people are brought to us through the dance hall whom we could not reach otherwise.

DR. RAINSFORD—If I had the money I would build a great social hall on the lower east side and I would have a soft drink bar in connection with it.

DR. DE COSTA—The trouble is with all discussions of this kind that there is no recognition of anything but dead Protestantism. They ask why don't people go to church? They never ask why Catholics do go to church. The largest religious body in the land is ignored. Catholics do not need to fill their churches by starting libraries or clubs, though they have plenty of them, together with all the social attractions known, as a usual thing. But their churches are crowded all the same where they do not exist. Catholics do not need attractions. They go to church from a sense of duty.

DR. CADMAN—Catholics do not go to church from a sense of duty, but of fear.

DR. DE COSTA—The Catholic congregations speak for themselves. Of nine crowded services at the Church of St. Francis Xavier on Sunday morning only one has any regular sermon or any music whatever. Catholics need no sermons or music. If Mr. Coler would go to school to Catholics for a Sunday or two he would change his statement. The fact is that the people are tired of Protestantism, and the promise of fans and ice-water, together with the other matters, does not move them. You must have the Mass for the masses.

DR. CADMAN—That is not strictly true. The constant tide of Catholic immigration into this country scarcely supplies the loss brought about by the indifference of the second and third generations of Roman Catholics born in the country, who, through American influences, revolt against the simple faith of their parents, holding it in a haphazard and half-hearted way.

There are some good suggestions in this discussion, but unquestionably the chief objection to making more use, and especially more educational use, of the church buildings is the fact that the preachers themselves are but very ill-trained, as a rule, to become teachers of really useful knowledge, and can only evade unpleasant comparisons and dangerous discussion by keeping their churches closed against rational and scientific teachers and maintaining the "sacred" character of their bricks and mortar and organ-pipes. As Dr. Rainsford said, men who have "given evidence of a desire to serve the community and uphold the truth" might be acceptable, but it is evident from this and other remarks that the leading idea of all these men is, not how to make the church serve the masses, but how to make the masses serve the church,—how to get the masses into the church while still maintaining that worn-out theology insistence upon which has led to their withdrawal and indifference? Even Commissioner of Charities J. W. Keller thinks it impossible to desecrate the church buildings by having an occasional entertainment in them. Evidently he believes in sanctified blocks of wood and stone. Dr. Rainsford is one of the most liberal of the preachers, but even he looks upon the amusements he has provided as only so many sprats given as baits to catch herrings for the orthodox net.

Dr. De Costa's explanation, adopting Comptroller

Coler's sapient expression, forms as bad an indictment of the church as could be imagined. His logic is of an essentially ministerial character. The churches are away from the people because the people are away from the churches! This may be called trenchant criticism—for a parson. But he says the reason the people stay away is due to the fact that "hard social conditions give no time for them to draw near." Now, if this were true—and the evidence of some of the other speakers shows very clearly that it is false, for we are told that the people prefer lodge rooms and music halls with bars attached to the attractions of the church—if it were true that the "hard social conditions" kept them away from the church, the fact would prove conclusively that the church had failed in its mission. Instead of "drawing all men" to the "uplifted Christ," it has driven them or allowed them to fall into the clutches of the saloon-keeper. What sort of salvation is this? The fact is, the only salvation offered by the church is that secured by the preachers.

It is amusing to note that Dr. De Costa thinks Comptroller Coler knows nothing about the churches, while Dr. Cadman says Mr. Coler has simply called for what in his case has proved an immensely successful plan. It is certain that, to a large extent, the people are still attracted by a man who can put energy and spice into his expositions of the most diabolical doctrines, and this is proved by such cases as those of Spurgeon, Talmage, Sam Jones, etc.

In speaking of the Catholics, in our opinion Dr. De Costa perhaps innocently hits the truth. Catholics are more loyal to their church than Protestants. Without being very much more intelligent than the Catholic, the Protestant has heard a few things that prevent him from being so deeply hypnotized by his priest as the Catholic, and as he cannot be easily reached by clerical anathemas, he naturally more easily drops away from the ministrations of an unattractive preacher.

Certainly, as Ballington Booth said, opening churches on week evenings would attract many people; and it is on this line that we think Freethinkers might well take a lesson, if they feel an incentive to do their full share towards elevating their less-favored fellow men. If a few wealthy Freethinkers in each town would buy a church or put up a suitable building, open it with a well-stocked library and reading room and ordinary club arrangements, give lectures and entertainments during the week, and open the rooms on Sunday as well, without making a feature of anti-Christian propagandism, we think the experiment could not fail of success, and would compel many of the churches to adopt a somewhat similar plan. It has been objected to such a plan, that a scheme to be permanently successful must be self-supporting, and possibly such a condition must be accepted as legitimate; but certainly no great movements in the moral and religious fields have ever been started without great self-sacrifices, and what is wanted to-day is an example the success of which would lead to the adoption of a similar plan by the more liberal churches, and thus render the continuance of the example no longer necessary. But it could not be carried out without considerable expense and work, the burden of which—as even in the older institutions—must of necessity fall upon a few shoulders. What we aim at is a really free Sunday, and though it may be coming, the progress it is making is extremely slow, and would be wonderfully hastened by such an example as that of which we have spoken, and which could be easily furnished by the Freethinkers in any of the large towns in Canada.

## THE WORLD-ENIGMA ; The Answer of the Nineteenth Century.

A SUMMARY OF THE "WELTRATHSEL" (WORLD ENIGMA) OF  
PROF. ERNST HAECKEL, PH.D., M.D., LL.D., SC.D.

(By Joseph McCabe, issued by the Rationalist Press Committee as a supplement to Watts' Literary Guide for April, 1900.)

### WHAT IS THE "WORLD-RIDDLE" ?

TIME was when man looked out upon the world, and down the avenues of the past and onward into the future, only to find himself surrounded by an infinity of enigmas. Even now, as Prof. Haeckel says, "the uneducated member of a civilized community, just as much as the savage, is environed by countless world-riddles at every step." But with the advance and diffusion of knowledge the number of problems grows smaller. Fifty years ago science seemed fairly in the way of dissipating all the mystery of life. One aspect of life after another was wrested from the theologian and mysticist, and illumined with a naturalist interpretation. Now, at the close of the nineteenth century, we witness a reaction. The forces of superstition and conservatism are rampant and influential; enlightened thinkers are belying the promise of science and offering a base to mysticism. Against this reaction Dr. Ernest Haeckel, "a thorough child of the nineteenth century," as he calls himself, raises an eloquent protest. He reviews the scientific discoveries and theories of the century, and shows that mysticism of the dualistic order is utterly out of court. The Monism of Spinoza has been amply substantiated. The so-called enigmas of Boi-Reymond and his like are no longer mysteries—the origin of the world, of life, of thought, of free-will, and so forth. One great enigma still remains—the intimate nature of the one great substance, illimitable in time and space, of which matter and force are the two chief features, and which makes up all things in heaven and earth. But the great problem of Dualism or Monism, with all its subsidiary problems, has been solved; there is no longer a basis for theism and ecclesiasticism.

### SCIENCE AND THE HUMAN BODY.

Our knowledge of the human frame, so essential to a full understanding of human nature, was long retarded by the prohibition of the dissection of corpses. Even so late as the 15th century the practice was visited with capital punishment. As soon as the tyranny of the Church was broken, and scientists were free to devote themselves efficiently to human and comparative anatomy, very remarkable discoveries were made; the most significant of these being the discovery that man begins his career as a single, tiny cellule, and that even the fully developed organism is a vast, orderly community of these minute elements. So careful has been the research into the frame of man and of the other animals, that the "origin of man" is now placed beyond reasonable dispute. Dr. Haeckel here marshals his vast wealth of zoological facts in a new and striking fashion. He takes the large division of the animal world known as the vertebrates, and enumerates their characteristic features. Man possesses all these distinctive features, and is therefore "a true vertebrate." In the same way, Dr. Haeckel analyzes the distinguishing features of the successive sub-groups—tetrapods, mammals, placentals, primates, and catarrhiniæ (or old-world monkeys), and proves that man belongs by every scientific title to these divisions of the animal world. It is inconceivable how

any informed, impartial truth-seeker can resist the evolutionary theory which these facts so eloquently indicate.

### THE ACTIVITY OF THE ORGANISM.

Like structure, like function, is a biological axiom; they are, as Mivart has said, the convex and concave aspects of a curved line. The author, therefore, has an easy though necessary task in proving that the life of the human body is entirely similar to that of cognate species. Circulation of the blood, respiration, lactation, are distinctive features in mammals; man possesses them. Besides the well-known similarities of ape-life to that of man, physiology has discovered certain peculiarities in the activity of the heart, the division of the breasts, and the sexual life of apes which are likewise shared by man alone. The evidence of genetic relationship is scientifically overwhelming. As in the preceding chapter, the author gives an interesting historical introduction to his subject, and shows how the attempt to revive "Vitalism"—the theory that would make the "principle of life" to be of a different character from the natural forces of the organism—is a reversion to ancient speculation in the teeth of all modern biological research.

### THE TESTIMONY OF EMBRYOLOGY.

Through long and laborious stages, which are fully detailed by the author, we have arrived at a true science of embryology. Baer discovered the human ovulum, the true point of departure, in 1827. In quick succession there came the discoveries of the spermatozoa, of the precise character of impregnation, and of the rapid subdivision and differentiation of the germ. We can now follow the evolution of the individual human organism from the tiny cellule through every stage of growth. Once more we have to study, not merely human, but comparative embryology, and the full significance of our discoveries is clear. Man commences his existence as a unicellular organism, passes through the same metamorphoses as the animals from which he is held to have descended, and is only gradually differentiated in his growth as a Vertebrate, a Mammal, a Primate, and ultimately a Human infant. For this embryological fact "there is but one explanation—heredity from a common parent form." So in the environment of the fœtus. The higher vertebrates—reptiles, birds, and mammals—have the embryo enclosed in protective coverings filled with water. This was unnecessary in their aquatic predecessors. The origin of these structures, the Amnion and the Chorion, and of the Allantois, is just the same in man as in the other higher vertebrates. Even ten years ago there were creationists who contended that man had certain peculiarities in his embryonic development. Selenka proved in 1890 that these were shared by others of the Primates, especially the orang. Man has clearly inherited his whole structure and life.

### THE TESTIMONY OF PALEONTOLOGY.

Dr. Haeckel takes us once more through the myths and legends and speculations which preceded the splendid work of Charles Darwin. The investigation of fossil forms in the rocks has proceeded far enough to close the case for human evolution. Comparative anatomy and physiology suffice of themselves to point out the broad lines of that evolution, and, when embryology adds its independent witness that man's individual development runs through precisely those stages and specific forms in the womb, the case is strongly reinforced. When, further, we find that the fossilized forms appear in the earth's crust in the chronological order which the theory demands, it passes beyond the range of rational controversy. We are

not merely justified in drawing up the fundamental law that "Ontogenesis [individual development] is a brief and rapid recapitulation of Phylogenesis [development of species], determined by the physiological functions of heredity (transmission) and adaptation (nourishment)," but we are bound to do so. Recently, in 1894, a fossil form of peculiar significance came to light. It is probably a "missing link" between man and his simian cousins: half-man and half-ape, it is a representative of the extinct species through which man ascended, like the anthropoid apes, from catarrhina, or old-world monkeys.

#### THE PSYCHOLOGICAL QUESTION.

So vast is the accumulation of facts in support of the thesis thus far—it may be truly said that every fact of anatomy, zoology, embryology, and paleontology supports it—that very few informed thinkers further oppose it. But the long-continued practice of dividing man into *body* and *soul* has inspired another obstructive theory. There are some eminent Christian zoologists who hold that though the human body was certainly developed, the soul was directly created. This is an aspect of the evolutionary question which has not received adequate attention. Obviously, however, it is a scientific question, and lends itself to the same treatment, in a general way, as the question of the origin of the body. A zoologist with a complete survey of the whole animal kingdom can tell us whether the mental or psychic functions which make up the "soul" of man have arisen on our planet by the same secular process of evolution as the structural parts which make up his body. No living zoologist is more competent to answer the question than Prof. Haeckel.

#### THE NATURE OF THE "SOUL."

We have left far behind in the history of thought the idea that the soul is, as Plato taught, an entity quite complete and operative in itself, or even that, as Descartes conceived, it sat like a telegraph girl in a minute structure in the centre of the brain. The brain is the organ of thought, sensation, and volition. Yet psychology is still obsessed by this fatal difficulty, that few of its students have a perfect knowledge of the brain. Hence it is that the science is still haunted by so much mysticism and enfeebled by so much vacillation—as the author shows in the cases of Kant, Virchow, and Du Bois-Raymond. The psychologist must be equipped with a thorough knowledge of the organ of thought. Dr. Haeckel, however, is too well-balanced a thinker to reject the introspective method in psychology, as Comtists do. Moreover, he re asserts the leading principle of his method—we must call philosophical speculation to our aid as well as experience. We must seek, too, all the collateral aid which the allied branches of science can give—comparative animal psychology, comparative human psychology (the psychology of races and ethnography), ontogenetic psychology (the study of infant and child), and phylogenetic psychology (the historical development of mind).

#### STAGES OF MENTAL LIFE.

The most important outcome of all this activity is the discovery of the "psychological unity of the whole organic world." The life of all living things is a development of sensation and motion, and is indissolubly connected with certain material antecedents in the living substance of the body—the plasma or protoplasm; the "soul" is but a collective title for "all the psychic functions of the plasma." The real task of the psychologist, therefore, is to determine the stages by which the human soul—the mental functions it covers—has arisen from a long

series of animal ancestors. Taking the actual powers of the mind in the order of their complexity, we find that they correspond to the grouping of the animal world, just as the nerve-structures do which they involve. We are presented with a vast picture of the organic species arranged in psychological order. In the earliest stage the whole psychoplasm is sensitive and reacts to stimuli. In the next stage, hairs and pigment spots, the crude beginnings of sense-organs, begin to appear on the surface of the organism. In the third stage, a specific differentiation of sense-organs sets in; and this is followed, in the fourth stage, by a centralization of the nervous system. Finally, a high development of the central part of the nervous system takes place, and conscious sensation begins. These are not merely the hypothetical, they are the historical stages in the development of the nervous system and of sensibility. Each function is similarly traced through the actual hierarchy of the animal world, and through the "natural history of creation," until even man's highest powers—reason, volition, and emotion (freedom of the will is rejected as an illusion)—are brought into the unity of the organic world. This tracing of the growth of the soul, illustrated by myriads of zoological facts, forms a most valuable and interesting chapter.

#### EMBRYONIC AND CHILD PSYCHOLOGY.

On the psychic as well as on the bodily side, embryology gives full confirmation to the Monistic theory. The old myths of a transmigration, or a transplantation, or a direct creation of souls rested on a basis of ignorance. There is no higher soul in the human germ than in any other unicellular organism. But, unlike the "soul" of the protista, the soul of the impregnated ovule has inherited a type, with the accidental disturbances arising from a duality of parentage. This leads the author into the thorny problems of heredity, which attract so much attention at the present day. On the broad question, however, the evidence leads to the same conclusion as in the preceding section: "the history of the germ is an epitome of the history of the species," bearing in mind, of course, the circumstance that the embryo is cut off from the influence of the environment by its amniotic protection. In confirmation of this "law," the author devotes the next chapter to tracing the historical development of mind. We can but briefly indicate the line of development, which Dr. Haeckel works out with abundant empirical illustration: 1, Unicellular protozoa with a simple cell-soul—as in the infusoria; 2, multicellular protozoa with a "cenobitic" soul—infusoria and rhizopods; 3, the oldest metazoa with an epithelial soul—plants and nerveless animal forms; 4, invertebrate forms with simple nervous apparatus—as the vermalia; 5, vertebrates with rudimentary spinal chord, without skull or brain—the acrania; 6, animals with skull and brain; 7, mammals with a preponderating development of the brain-cortex; 8, anthropoid apes and man.

#### CONSCIOUSNESS AND IMMORTALITY.

Each of these important problems claims a long and interesting chapter. After reviewing the principal theories of the range of consciousness—the Cartesian (that it is peculiar to man), the Darwinian (that it is present only in man and the higher animals), the theory of Schopenhauer (that it is found in all animals, and these only), the biological (that it is a common feature of all organisms), the cellular theory (that each cellule has its consciousness), and the atomistic (that it is a property of every atom)—the author subscribes rather to the Darwinian, or neurological: consciousness seems to dawn with the gradual



centralization of the nervous system. As to its character, Dr. Haeckel is by no means in agreement with those who consider it to be an insoluble problem. The anatomic study of the cortex of the brain and the curious phenomena of "diseases" of consciousness (double-consciousness, etc.) have clearly proved it to be a physiological function of the cerebral cortex. This is again enforced by a study of the rise of consciousness in the individual and in the mass.

On the question of immortality, or "athanism," the author has a severely critical chapter. He rightly refuses to dally with the metaphorical "immortality" of modern trimmers, and he enumerates, fully and correctly, and dismisses in one page, all the poor sophisms that are put forward in defence of personal immortality. He has a well-merited measure of scorn too, for modern juggling over the terms "matter" and "spirit." The latter conception is almost always material; there is the fluid "spirit" and the solid spirit, the atmospheric "soul," the etheric soul, and the gaseous soul—the author suggests that the spirits may yet lend themselves to the Dewar treatment of gases. Immortality is a dream and a delusion, full of absurdities (in its orthodox presentation), and diametrically opposed to scientific anthropology. "The best we can wish after a brave life devoted to good purpose, according to our conscience, is the eternal peace of the grave."

#### FROM MICRO- TO MACROCOSM.

After thus devoting more than half his space to the treatment of the great problems that concern human nature in itself, the author passes on to the "cosmological section" of his plan. Here we are introduced to what the author considers to be "the greatest intellectual achievement of the nineteenth century"—the "law of substance." We have seen the disappearance of the chasms which were supposed to sever life and thought from the rest of the universe. Reason and emotion are gradually unfolded out of the rudimentary consciousness and sensibility which go deep down into the organic world; these simpler psychic qualities, in their turn, gradually merge, as we trace them downwards, into the physical and chemical properties of protoplasm. But the physical sciences have been working towards unity as actively and successfully as the biological, and the result is an unshakable basis for the monistic view of nature. Two great laws have been formulated during the present century—the persistence, or conservation, of energy, and the persistence of matter; no particle of matter or force is either created or destroyed. These two laws are but two aspects of the fundamental law of substance, for matter and force are only the two attributes of the one ultimate reality. The author, with Goethe, considers Spinoza's idea of the unity underlying all individual things to be "the noblest, deepest and truest thought of all times." The unity of force has been abundantly proved; the unity of matter is accepted in all the theories of the origin of atoms and elements, of the nature of ether and of ponderable matter. All these theories are reviewed in detail by the author. Only the dualistic theory of substance—that there are immaterial as well as material substances—has been rendered untenable by modern science.

#### COSMIC EVOLUTION.

The old myth of creation, with its varied modern restrictions and elaborations, has been swept aside by the triumph of evolution. The unity, or continuity, of the world in point of time has been proved as utterly as its unity in actual existence. In the first place, all talk about the "beginning of the world" and the mystery in which it is said to be involved is pure assump-

tion. The earlier evolutionists, unfortunately, lent themselves to this interpretation. Modern astronomy and physics have shown that the "law of substance" rules in the remotest regions of space as it does on earth. "We are logically driven to the important admission that the persistence of matter and force has been as universal in all time as it is to-day." In any case, our observations force us to conceive the world as illimitable in time as well as in space. The evolution of worlds is a great drama that is continually going on around us. While suns are dying out in one corner of space, others are just commencing their life; moreover, the extinct solid stars are apt to collide, and the enormous heat generated is sufficient to reduce them to their simplest elements, and the whole evolution begins over again. There is no ground whatever for assuming a beginning to this cyclic process. The idea that all force is being gradually transformed into heat, which is only partially reconverted, is of no consequence, as the mere collision of two masses generates enough "living force" for a new cosmic process; and those who fear that this points to an end of the world are misled by partial experiments. Geology has taken up the thread of the story from astronomy, and worked out the development of the earth. Many million years ago—"certainly more than a hundred million"—the globe that had been cast off by the condensing nebula cooled down sufficiently to allow the water to settle on it. Then began the long drama of organic evolution, of whose last act we are the witnesses and the participants. Biological evolution is now as irresistible as astronomical and geological. Darwin, says Dr. Haeckel, "has been the Copernicus of the organic world."

#### THE UNITY OF THE COSMOS.

In the next chapter Dr. Haeckel sets out to prove the correctness of the fundamental and titular idea of his philosophy—the monism, or unity, of all things. The author is sometimes described as a materialist; but he resents the title. He is neither a spiritualist nor a materialist. The fount and base of all existence is an inscrutable substance of which matter and spirit (in the sense of force; immaterial substance he entirely rejects) are the two chief aspects. The real antithesis of his philosophy is dualism—the theory that holds we cannot explain life, or thought, or the cosmos as a whole, without postulating spiritual and transcendental agencies. The first position taken up by the dualist is at the origin of life. The author points out confusion which is usually associated with the idea of spontaneous generation. Modern scientific experiments—such as those of Pasteur and Tyndall—prove nothing whatever as to the primeval origin of organisms. In fact, modern chemical research into the character of complex combinations of carbon has constructed a natural bridge from the inorganic to the organic world. In the developed organism the apparent "purpose" of the various parts is invoked as proof of the inherence of an other than material force. Against this we have not only the theory of selection, but we have quite a science of "dysteleology." Rudimentary, imperfect, hurtful organs negative the idea of prevision and preordination. The whole question of teleology, of purpose and of chance, including the problem of a moral purpose in history, is treated at length. There is no proof whatever, from end to end of the universe, from the beautiful markings of a diatom to the vicissitudes of human history, of any prevision or preordination. Science, when its data are soberly interpreted, finds one entity—nature—slowly, blindly, painfully unfolding itself on the theatre of time.

## THE DEATH OF THE GODS.

Belief in a god or gods—and the author treats exhaustively (and caustically) the innumerable forms of that belief—was a temporary speculation which the nineteenth century has rendered superfluous and untenable. It was based, in so far as it had an element of rationality, on the gaps in our knowledge of nature. Astronomical, biological, and physiological discoveries have sufficiently filled up those gaps to make the old hypothesis no longer even plausible. Modern science has to say to the Theist who asks where God comes in in his construction of the cosmos, in the words of Laplace to Napoleon: "Sir, I have managed without that hypothesis." The supposed commencement of the scheme of things, on which all belief in a Creator and "prime mover" is founded, was a gratuitous assumption, and is utterly discountenanced by modern astronomy. The origin of life needs no supernatural intervention, neither does the origin of thought, of religion, or of morality. Science and philosophy point to the unity of the cosmos. Every form and phase of Theism is denuded of argumentative basis, besides the fact that the dominant conception of a personal God—the notion of a huge "gaseous vertebrate," as Haeckel puts it—is even less rational in itself, and is just as clearly a reflection of human thought, as any that has preceded it in the history of mysticism. Nothing short of Pantheism or Atheism is reconcilable with modern knowledge of reality. Atheism is but one expression of the negative aspect of Pantheism. As Schopenhauer wrote: "The axiom of the Pantheist, 'God and the world are one,' is only a polite way of giving the Lord God his *conge*."

## FAITH—HEALTHY AND DISEASED.

With the chapter on the nature of knowledge and of faith the author enters upon the fourth and last stage of his comprehensive task. The section is entitled "Theological." Since God has been summarily disposed of in the preceding section, the remaining chapters have rather to deal with general questions connected with religion, principally faith, morals and historical Christianity. An analysis of the origin and mode of our knowledge leads to a recognition of "the inestimable value of the senses." Locke's famous dictum, "*Nihil est in intellectu quod non fuerit in sensu*," is fully approved by modern monistic psychology. Yet Dr. Haeckel gives no opportunity for mysticists to raise their crude cry that the scientist rejects the supernatural because he cannot touch and see it: There is a legitimate and necessary channel of knowledge beyond the explicit evidence of the senses. Faith and hypothesis are necessary even for the scientist. He "believes" truths innumerable which no sense organ ever communicated to him. The fact is that we have thought-organs as well as sense-organs. In the elaborate development of the cortex of the human brain the lower and outer sections remain sense-centres, but the lower and inner are occupied with the manipulation of the sense-impressions and the extraction of further truths from them. The faith (or superstition) of the Theist is a perversion of this function. It is a wandering of the imagination beyond the justification of our real impressions. The same must be said of spiritism and telepathy.

## CHRISTIANITY.

Strauss, Hartmann and Draper have written at length on the conflict between Christianity and science. Lately, however, "the attacks of the Church militant upon science in general, and evolution in particular, have been particularly keen and

menacing;" witness the proceedings "of Christian synods and even of the German Reichstag during the last few years," which have a parallel in many other lands. There is a revival, in Church and State, of the attempt to secure absolute dominion at the expense of free-thought and free-speech.

It is necessary, therefore, to review here the historic struggle of science and the Church. We find four stages in the development of Christianity. The first stage is the primitive Church of the first three centuries. Of the earliest Church and its founder we must speak with caution, the author concludes, after a critical examination of the Gospels and the Epistles. Two things, at least, we know—namely, that "Christ, the noble prophet and enthusiast, so full of human love, was far below the level of classical culture," and that his primitive followers formed a "Social-democratic" community, such as any following respecting modern Christian community would look down upon with scorn. The second stage, from the third century to the Reformation, is the period of Latin Christianity and the Papacy. On the Church of Rome the author pours a flood of perfectly just criticism. It is summed up as follows:

"All that we esteem in early Christianity and its founder, and that we must seek to save from the wreck of this transitory world-religion for our new monistic religion, lies on its ethical and social plane. Principles of true humanity, the Golden Rule, tolerance, human love in the best and highest sense of the word. . . . The Papacy has sought to turn all those virtues into the direct opposite, and still to hang out the sign of the old firm."

The next stage opens with the Reformation. In spite of the grave defects and incompleteness of their work, "the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries retain the honor of having opened out a path for the thoughtful mind, and freed reason from the heavy yoke of the Papal dominion." The fourth stage is marked by the "false Christianity" of the nineteenth century, the fruitless struggle with science, the lingering reaction of Papistry. The author gives a lengthy and interesting analysis of the "Immaculate Conception."

## THE NEW RELIGION.

In a very eloquent chapter is expounded the beauty of the religion of nature which is to follow the dying religion of super-nature.

"It seems to be of supreme importance that modern science should not only shatter the vain structures of superstition, and remove their deserted ruins from the path, but that it erect itself a new habitable abode for human sentiment on the ground it has cleared: a Palace of Reason, in which, in virtue of our new monistic theory of life, we do reverence to the real trinity of the nineteenth century—the trinity of the True, the Good, and the Beautiful."

In the first respect we must break entirely with the past; the high gifts of the goddess of Truth are "the fruit of the tree of knowledge," not the outcome of superstitious faith. It is otherwise with the ideal of the Good. The virtues of (early) Christian ethics we accept; they are, indeed, like the "golden rule" of Christ, centuries older than Christianity. We have only to correct the Christian emphasis on altruism and self-sacrifice by teaching the true relation of egoism and altruism. As to the ideal of beauty, the monistic religion finds itself in supreme antagonism with Christianity. True Christianity despises this life, and puts all beauty and desire beyond the tomb; the monistic religion has to preach and develop the beauty and the joy of present human life; monistic art must depict for us the slighted æsthetic wealth of nature. No doubt

there will always be men who will desire something in the nature of a Church (and the author gives practical suggestions for a monistic Church in the appendix), but the man who has science and art (and, *therefore*, religion, as Goethe said) "needs no special Church, no narrow confined space"; "he finds his Church everywhere in noble Nature herself."

#### MONISTIC ETHICS.

But the ethical question has a distinct importance and interest, so the author discusses it at length in the following chapter. Monistic ethics is based on the scientific truth that "there are not two distinct and separate worlds—one physical and material, the other moral and immaterial." No system of morality that contravenes this truth is any longer tenable. Kant built up the two halves of his philosophy in sheer self-contradiction. But there is no need whatever to transcend nature in constructing an ethical theory and framing an ethical sanction. Working on the lines laid down by Herbert Spencer, we come to a view of morality which is competent to meet the requirements of life, and which harmonizes those claims of egoism and altruism, of self and our neighbor, which have been so grossly distorted in Christian ethics. Man belongs to the social or gregarious vertebrates; he has, therefore, naturally, "two sets of duties—firstly, towards himself; secondly, towards the society he belongs to." This moral equality of egoism and altruism is the fundamental principle of the monistic ethics, the basis and fount of "the golden rule." The author then enters into a critical analysis of Christian ethics, which he severely condemns for its belittlement of (1) self, (2) love, (3) nature, (4) civilization, (5) the family, and (6) woman.

#### CONCLUSION.

In leading up to the conclusion of his task, Dr. Haeckel gives a synoptic review of the progress of the empirical sciences during the nineteenth century. Astronomy and physical sciences have worked hand in hand to build up a new cosmogony and cosmology. They have extended their theories by analogy to other cosmic bodies, giving a high probability to the theory of life in other worlds. Geology and paleontology have continued the story of development, revealing the continuity of the growth of the inorganic and organic worlds. Physics and chemistry have penetrated deep into the problem of matter and force. Biology has achieved the great triumphs of the cellular theory and evolution. Anthropology, the science of man, starting from such data, has been enabled to solve the mystery of the origin and the nature of human life, and correct our morbid anthropism. Thus one by one the riddles of life, have broken down: the problems of origins, of life, of thought, of conscience. We stand face to face, at the close of the nineteenth century, with one sole enigma—the nature of the great substance that underlies matter and force. The nineteenth century has magnificently achieved its task of unifying nature and banishing the phantom of supernature. It leaves the "world-riddle" of substance to its successor.

#### THE EXTINCTION OF CREED.

The extinction of a religion is not the abrupt movement of a day, it is a secular process of many well-marked stages—the rise of doubt among the candid; the disapprobation of the conservative; the defence of ideas fast becoming obsolete, by the well-meaning, who hope that allegory and new interpretations may give renewed probability to what is almost incredible. But dissent ends in denial at last.—*Draper*.

## THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

BY FREDERIC MAY HOLLAND, AUTHOR OF "LIBERTY IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY," ETC.

### CHAP. V. LOUIS XVI. AND THE CONVENTION.

THERE had been no oppression in Boston to be compared with that in Paris; but the French Revolution was hastened by the American. Lafayette and his companions in war brought back personal knowledge of the benefits of letting each town manage her own affairs, enabling every man to take the place for which he was most fit, and making all sects and classes equal before the law. The writings of Jefferson and Paine increased the influence of Voltaire, Holbach and Rousseau. France was full of revolutionary ideas; but they might not have armed themselves with pikes and muskets if the government had not made itself helplessly bankrupt by helping the Americans.

Turgot, the minister of finance, was their friend, but he opposed war with England as too expensive; and he might have carried his point, if he had not been dismissed from office in 1776 for proposing reforms which might have averted revolution. Louis XVI. wrote to him, "It is only you and I who love the people;" but the nobles, the bishops, and worst of all the queen, were indignant at plans to abolish useless offices in the palace, tax the rich instead of the poor, establish local self-government, and even allow Protestants to educate their own children and hold public worship. Turgot's successors met the cost of war and pageantry by borrowing vast sums of money; and at last the inability of the treasury to meet even necessary expenses had to be acknowledged, when France was smitten by famine.

The King, was obliged to summon representatives of the people, the clergy, and the nobility to meet for consultation in 1789 at Versailles. He wished only for revenue; but the people wanted reform; and their representatives, led by Mirabeau, obliged the other delegates to join them in forming an assembly, where the privileged classes were in the minority. The King sought help from his troops, but those stationed near by at Paris were more ready to take part with the citizens; the capture of the Bastille by a mob, on July 14, disclosed his weakness; and the riot, excited by starving women in October, brought him into pompous captivity in the great city. Hereditary despotism tends to fall into feeble hands. He was a king for whom his own nobles would not die.

The Assembly, which came to Paris with Louis, had already abolished primogeniture and other feudal privileges, equalized taxation, and made all men eligible to office. The new constitution began by anticipating Herbert Spencer, so far as to declare that "Liberty is power to do whatever does not injure others," and that "Only actions injurious to society should be prohibited by law." Every citizen could print his opinions freely, and express his religious feelings in any way which did not disturb the public peace. The suffrage was given to all men of twenty-five who paid taxes; there was local self-government everywhere; and the existing division into departments was introduced in order to destroy provincial exclusiveness. Free public schools were promised to all children, in a nation where only about one adult in twenty-six had been taught to read and write.

The King, while still absolute, had been persuaded by Lafayette to annul some of the laws which made Protestantism

a crime. The Assembly abolished all disabilities of Jews as well as of heretics, and declared that government has no authority over religion. The Catholic priests and bishops were salaried; but a right of election was given to the people; monks and nuns were enabled to leave the cloister; and the vast wealth of the church was made public property. This last measure did more to drive away capital than to bring in revenue; and the indignation of the clergy was increased by the imposition of an oath, framed so strictly as to be rejected by a large majority, including nearly every bishop. Dismissal of the non-jurors made them dangerous conspirators.

Louis swore fidelity to the constitution by which he was still king; but he left behind a repudiation of his oath when he fled from Paris with the queen in June, 1791. They hoped to return with an Austrian army. Then it was that the first suggestion of a republic in France was made by Thomas Paine, who had come to Europe because, as he said, "Where Liberty is not, there is my country." He had exposed Burke's misrepresentations of the revolution, and shown by the example of America that monarchy is useless. Thousands were reading his declaration, in the first part of the "Rights of Man," that toleration is only a counterfeit of real liberty in religion. The second part, which came out in 1792, speaks of the tendency of commerce "to unite mankind by rendering nations, as well as individuals, useful to each other," and adds these words, "My country is the world; and my religion is to do good."

Louis had in the meantime been brought back to Paris, where he swore again to support the constitution, and then invited the king of Prussia to come and destroy it. To the danger of invasion was added that of anarchy. Many of the new magistrates were without experience; insecurity of property kept the supply of food insufficient; and the populace was infuriated by famine. The only way for the French to preserve liberty was to keep at peace with foreigners and among themselves; but too severe measures were proposed against non-jurors and refugees. All the protests of Robespierre, Danton, and Marat, did not prevent a declaration of war, early in 1792, against Germany. A change of government was needed; but it was unfortunately made by the National Guards of Paris. These armed citizens stormed the Tuileries, on August 10, after a bloody conflict; and the legislature had to vote that the King cease to reign and that a convention be elected to frame a new constitution. Invasion by a Prussian army, in which Goethe served, called out such a panic at Paris, that thousands of priests and other royalists, suspected of being conspirators, were massacred with impunity in prison by assassins whose avowed purpose was not to punish opinions but deeds. Danton and other patriots were doing their utmost to arouse both soldiers and citizens to the enthusiasm which saved France.

The establishment of the republic, on September 21, 1792, ought to have been promptly followed by the creation of a strong executive; and the new constitution should have been accepted by the people, before bringing on more dangerous invasions, as well as civil war, by the execution of Louis as a traitor. This portentous deed was opposed by Paine and other deputies sent by republicans of the wealthier class. There was a sad lack of concert, however, in this party, known as Girondist, because its main strength was in the south. Its members were indignant at the recent massacre and opposed to lawless proceedings. Some wished for peace, and were drafting a constitution more favorable to individual liberty than vigorous administration. Others helped to establish that com-

mittee of Public Safety, soon to be their destroyer; and they had already challenged all kings to make war on France by proclaiming her readiness to help any other nation become a republic. These jingoes, as we may call them, voted for the execution of Louis; but it might have been prevented, if all the Girondists had stood firm against it. This party was in the majority in the convention, and continued powerful throughout the revolution.

Still more prominent, because bolder and more united, was the party of Robespierre, Danton, Marat, and other regicides who wanted a strongly centralized republic, with severe measures against non-jurors and aristocrats. They were supported by the poorer and more patriotic class of citizens, especially in Paris. There they controlled not only the National Guards but the Commune, a term which then meant merely the body of municipal magistrates, and was not yet associated with communism. Members of this party were known as Jacobins, on account of the place where their principal meetings were held; and rich men who wore knee-breeches called them *sans-culottes*, because most of them dressed as laborers did then, and as all men do now in civilized lands. It is in the same way that the Puritans were called "Round-heads," because they cut their hair almost as short as gentlemen do at present.

Co-operation between these two parties was sorely needed, but was made impossible by the violence of some of the Girondists against not only Robespierre and Marat, but even against Danton, who was doing his utmost to preserve harmony. The execution of Louis brought on war with Spain, and also with England, whose commercial privileges had been assailed; and there was a formidable revolt of the Vendéans, who had supplied meat to Paris. The scarcity of food was increased by depreciation of the currency, which was to have been redeemed by selling the land taken from the clergy. What conquests had been made in the north were lost by the defection of a general who had been in high favor with the Girondists.

The Jacobins were right in demanding a more energetic administration, but fatally in the wrong in overawing the majority of the deputies by the insurrection of National Guards which took place on the last day of May, 1793. Among the Girondists who were arrested illegally was Madame Roland. Others escaped to stir up insurrection in Lyons, Marseilles, Toulon, and other cities in Southern France. Thus both parties made the ruinous mistake of rushing to arms instead of appealing to the nation's vote. A civil war between these factions of Republicans in the South was added to that with the Royalists in the West; the northern, eastern, and southern frontiers were invaded by British, Austrian, Prussian, and Spanish armies; the famine was worse than ever; the legal tender sank to one-sixth of its nominal value; and anarchy was increased by the danger that all power might be seized by mobs.

#### CHAP. VI. THE REIGN OF TERROR.

It was to prevent restoration of all the old abuses and iniquities that dictatorial power was granted temporarily, in 1793, to mighty men like Danton, who had already said, "May my name be sullied, and France be saved." The Convention voted that all the young men fly to arms against rebellion and invasion; that the older men furnish food and weapons; that the women supply clothing; and that the children make lint. Forced loans were exacted of the rich; and paper money rose

to par value, when refusing it might mean death. Prices of food in Paris were kept low, the press and theatres muzzled, property confiscated, and weapons taken from dangerous hands by the Committee of Public Safety. A dozen irresponsible despots, among whom Robespierre was the best known, though not the most powerful, had unlimited power to remove or appoint generals, ministers, and magistrates, to have any offender executed, and to direct a subordinate committee, that of General Security, which had charge of the police. Trusty members of the Convention were sent out to inspect municipal administration everywhere, and see that all the armies carried out the plans prescribed by the noblest member of the almighty Committee, Carnot. Generals had to choose literally between victory and death; for failure led to the guillotine.

And now was seen the benefit of the system of unlimited promotion from the ranks. Before 1789, France, like her neighbors, had reserved the highest places in her army for men of noble birth; but most of them had deserted or been dismissed; and the vacancies had been filled by choosing the bravest and ablest soldiers, even if they had been peasants. Thus it was that Hoche, Pichgru, Augeran, Kleber, Masséna, Ney, and other sons of plebeian parents became famous generals. Armies under such leaders won battle after battle so rapidly as to become a terror to all Europe. The invaders were driven out before the end of 1793, and the rebels everywhere suppressed. The Girondists failed completely, because they were driven, though reluctantly, into alliance with the Royalists, who were unpopular everywhere, except in Brittany and the Vendée. With safety came plenty, for the harvests were abundant. Anarchy was put down completely; and life went on gaily in Paris.

There was too much cruelty in the latter part of 1793, especially in punishing Girondists at Lyons and Royalists at Nantes. Much more blood was shed in the latter city than was desired by the Committee; and they stopped the carnage in February. They must bear the whole blame of the executions in Paris. Most of the 243 victims in 1793 were traitors; but the case of Marie Antoinette was not the only one in which mercy would have been politic; and the death of Madame Roland and other Republicans of high character and ability was a deplorable loss. There was no excuse for prolonging the reign of terror after 1793; but despots are seldom willing to resign their power; and the number of executions kept increasing, until it rose to nearly two hundred a week in June and July. Prisoners were forbidden to have legal advice; and even children were put to death.

Danton's mighty oratory had twice called out the enthusiasm which saved France from conquest. He was still an ardent Republican; but he thought the Girondists were punished with needless cruelty; and such sympathy seemed dangerous. He was urged to save himself by leading a revolt; but he said, "I had rather be guillotined myself than guillotine anybody." Complaints of his venality and licentiousness brought the puritanical Robespierre, who at first defended him, to consent to his execution. With him, and for no offence but humanity, perished Camille Desmoulins, whose fiery words had called out the revolt which took the Bastille. The despot who sent them to the scaffold, Billaud-Varenne, afterwards declared, with deep remorse, that if they and Robespierre had lived, the Republic would have been too strong for Napoleon Bonaparte.

The members of the bloody Committee, especially Carnot and Robespierre, were terribly conscientious, as Paul was when

he persecuted the Christians. They knew of no better way to prevent the nobles from coming back to make the people slaves forever. What the Convention really wanted was shown by its decree, on February 4, 1794, to abolish slavery in all French colonies. The Jewish superstition, that people are insane because sin has made them the prey of Satan, had left behind it cruel practices, which continued, even in England and the United States, long after the beginning of the nineteenth century. The Reign of Terror enabled Pinel, first in modern times, to revive the humane methods practised in pagan Greece.

The priests and nuns who were executed at this time were punished for disloyalty, rather than piety; but there seem to have been some cases of persecution merely for religion, especially in the Vendée. All ministers, even the rabbis, were banished from Alsace. The churches were plundered; and worship was forbidden there, though not in private houses or public halls. The Convention's plan, for having every tenth day observed in place of every seventh, was enforced by local regulations, forbidding shops to be closed, labor in the fields to be suspended, and festive finery to be worn on Sunday, or by Jews on Saturday. Wayside crucifixes were generally destroyed, and the Bible was burned publicly, with relics of the saints, at Paris. The Commune of that city actually tried to abolish all worship but that of the Goddess of Reason. But the disorderly demonstrations in honor of this deity were soon suppressed by the Convention. It was decreed, as requested by Robespierre, that all citizens could have their own favorite ceremonies performed quietly, at their own expense; public declaration was made of belief in a Supreme Being, as well as in the immortality of the soul; and the leading atheists were silenced by the guillotine.

Capital punishment was inflicted so recklessly, however, in 1794 as to do incalculable and incurable injury to the cause of liberty. Public opinion had been friendly to the Revolution in England and the United States, but was now made hostile. France was robbed of those patriots who might afterwards have done the best service in preserving the Republic; the survivors were afraid to resist tyranny; and men of the highest character and ability refused to meddle with politics.

Robespierre finally saw that the Reign of Terror must stop; but he meant that the penalty should be paid by members of the Committees of Public Safety and General Security whom he hated personally, and especially by Billaud-Varenne. It was the 26th of July, 1794, and soon after the beginning of what was called, in the revolutionary calendar, "Thermidor," the month of heat, when Robespierre reappeared, after a long absence, in the Convention, and demanded the arrest of some traitors in the Committees. These men understood his purpose, and determined to beat him at his own game. The other members could see nothing in his plan, except a new proscription; each feared that he might himself fall a victim; and the long speech was received coldly. It was repeated that evening in the Jacobin Club, where he called out so much enthusiasm that he might have made himself master of Paris before morning, for the Commune was on his side. He waited to appeal again to the Convention; and meantime his enemies in the Committees persuaded all the members who wished to put an end to terrorism to join them against him. Next morning, he heard himself denounced by Billaud-Varenne, in a speech which called out an angry clamor of "Down with the tyrant." The noise was so great that Robespierre could not

make himself heard. At last his voice failed him; and one of the men whom he had meant to save shouted, "The blood of Danton chokes thee." His arrest was voted by acclamation; but two friends asked to be allowed to share his fate. One was his own brother, who believed in him to the last. A few others of his adherents were ordered into custody; and among them was Henriot, the commander of the National Guards.

The prisoners were at once set free by the Commune; the tocsin rang, and the National Guards turned out. It is hard to tell what might have happened, if their command had been given, as the younger Robespierre wished, to his friend Bonaparte. Henriot got drunk. Both he and Robespierre were proclaimed outlaws by the Convention; one of the deputies, Barras, was made commander of the guards; and his colleagues rode about with him, urging the citizens in arms to take sides with the Convention. Its authority had been established firmly by the terrible Committees; and the Commune was deserted by its own troops. The next afternoon, July 28, Robespierre and his adherents were carried to the guillotine, and the Reign of Terror was over. Thus ended what may be called the dramatic period of the Revolution. The five years since the representatives first met at Versailles had been full of great events

(To be continued.)

## The War Cloud and the Silver Lining.

BY CHARLES T. GORHAM.

It is generally recognized that ethical problems are of a highly complex nature, but we seldom attempt to trace in detail the manner in which the complications work out. The popular impression that a particular person or act is either good or bad takes no account of the many factors, both subjective and objective, which are requisite to the performance of social acts. We put a black label on one character and a white label on another character, forgetting that each is more likely to be some shade of grey.

If it is true of individuals that circumstance, environment, temperament, cannot wisely be ignored, it is still more true of communities, since the inevitable difficulties peculiar to the individual meet, and sometimes conflict, with an indefinite number of other difficulties peculiar to an indefinite number of other individuals. And the problem is further complicated by the fact that the individuals forming the governing body act not merely in their personal capacity, but as representing a still larger number of individuals in the background. The latter class, being dependent on imperfect information imperfectly apprehended, have little chance of forming reliable views on international questions. Even if they manage to obtain such views, they possess no thoroughly satisfactory means of making them known to the persons by whom they are represented in the national deliberations.

For these reasons—added, of course, to the absolute need that international communications should be made without consulting the public each time a despatch is sent abroad—it is practically impossible for the public as a body to form accurate judgments in relation to the proceedings of the governing power until long after they have been carried into effect, and the facts have become fully known. In a special degree, this remark applies to the grave question of war. While, from the purely ethical and individual point of view, war must be pronounced the greatest of human crimes, it is none the less

clear that in many cases war is justified by the sheer necessity of resorting to it in order to avoid evils which would prove in the long run infinitely greater.

Without going into the vexed question of the ethics of the present war (a question on which few persons can be competent to form a sound opinion), one can only say that if England's attitude has throughout been, as many of us believe, simply and solely one of self-defence, she is justified in spending enormous sums of money on her armaments, and shedding the blood of her sons like water on the rock-bound African veldt. Even if it were conceded that it is morally right to yield to the insolent display of force by a weaker power presuming on a repetition of a mistaken magnanimity, considerations of expediency at once forbid such a literal adherence to the precept of Jesus. But if we take all the circumstances into account, it cannot be granted that such a course is even morally laudable, since to yield to claims which we believe to be unjust is itself to aid the cause of injustice. And we know that magnanimity may at any moment be construed by the unfriendly into cowardice, and that for a nation like Great Britain to yield without a struggle would involve, not perhaps her ruin, but at least a serious blow to her prosperity and a check to the world's progress.

Though our sympathy with the agitation for peace at any price may, under the special conditions of the present conflict, be limited, it is at least a healthy sign that ethical protests against the barbarity of war should be made. In former times the moral sentiment for the most part failed to make itself heard or felt in any appreciable degree. War was accepted as a matter of course, and little was done either to prevent or to mitigate its horrors. It is a significant evidence of moral growth that humaner feelings should now be finding a voice. Imperialism is no doubt a very fine thing, and one which promises well for the future of that Anglo-Saxon race which is making a bold bid for leadership. But if it is to pilot the vessel of progress into a peaceful future, the Imperialism must be of the right sort—not the shrieking, shallow patriotism which exaggerates our own merits and depreciates those of others, and thirsts for the blood of its competitors; it must be sane and moderate, and touched with the living fire of sympathy, inasmuch as it seeks the truest welfare of the greatest number of human beings.

It is growth, or rather spread, of moral principles likely to continue? Surely there is every reason for hope. Against the unreasoning love of power and military glory which goes by the popular name of jingoism we may set the steady advance in education, the growth of larger ideas, the dropping away of the excrescences of a superstitious theology, and the improvement of the means by which enlightenment in all departments of thought is diffused. Rationalism in its widest sense means simply thinking in accordance with the laws of logic, and with the desire of discovering truth. Much, therefore, is to be hoped from the sure, though necessarily slow, progress of rational ideas on all subjects, from theology to warfare.

How will the war affect the cause of Rationalism? Is there any reason for the fear that it will seriously retard the progress of thought from the narrow to the broad, from the provincial to the cosmopolitan? It is one of the most striking facts of life that good often results from evil. War does undoubtedly sometimes awaken a people out of lethargy induced by prolonged peace and long-continued success in the art of money-making. So far from this war hindering the cause of Rationalism, the indications seem to point the other way.

The growth of the Imperial spirit, if wisely directed, surely means an advance from the insular to the world-wide. The great sentiment of human solidarity has already received an immense impetus by the strengthening of the tie between the colonies and the mother-country, and this sentiment of solidarity is one of the most important elements in the development of a reasonable and non-theological form of religion. The orthodox theistic attitude has been a little discredited during the war by both sides appealing to the same divine power for assistance, and both (occasionally) believing that they get it. There is a touch of humour in the Boers giving thanks to God for a victory one week, and the British rendering a similar tribute the next. This peculiarity is not likely to be of permanent benefit to either party, for the most inveterate pietist must in time perceive its absurdity.

Certain results of the war seem inevitable as fate. British supremacy will be established, with all its concomitant advantages—extension of trade, increase of personal liberty, equality of political rights for all white citizens, diffusion of education and material comfort. Is it not likely that greater intellectual activity will accompany this advance in civilization? And if we have intellectual activity, why should we fear that the cause of rational thought will suffer?—*Literary Guide*.

### Christian Revolutions.

BY CHARLES WATTS.

THE history of mental progress has been a record of intellectual revolution. The revolt against existing conditions is an indication of the desire to secure a change and an improvement. This has been strikingly manifested in the inception and history of Christianity. Age after age has been marked by a revolution within its fold. This brings to our mind three prominent errors which have been associated with the Christian faith from its dawn, and also through its many stages of development. These are its alleged divine origin, its historical continuity, and its definite authority. These were once regarded by Christian apologists as undoubted evidence of the unique character of the Christian religion. With the exception of a few persons of the strictly orthodox type, the defenders of the faith have now given up such claims. The most profound thinkers and the ablest writers in the Church to-day have abandoned the old notions entertained as to the introduction of Christianity into the world, its continuity of teachings, and a uniform recognition of its authority. In these three sections of apologetics an entire revolution has taken place, which, in our opinion, is a decided proof of the utter fallacy of the original pretensions urged in favor of the Christian faith. Moreover, it shows that Christianity has not been materially different from other religions in its rise and development. The lesson of history appears to us to be that all theological systems have been the outcome of the human mind in ages of ignorance and credulity; and that such systems have varied according to the intellectual status of the people by whom they were professed.

The latest proof furnished of the revolution which has occurred in reference to Christianity is in an article by Mr. W. H. Mallock, which appeared in the *Nineteenth Century* of Nov. last, entitled "The Intellectual Future of Catholicism." It is a severe blow to the boasted consistency and stability of Christianity in general, and of the Protestant faith in particular. It is also a pleasing

illustration of the rapid growth of Freethought criticism. Mr. Mallock seeks to show that the Roman Catholic Church is the only competent authority to settle the serious and important disputes now existing among the various Christian sects. He asserts in another form what we, as Secularists, have often contended—namely, that the final battle between reason and superstition will have to be fought by the adherents of Rationalism and of Roman Catholicism. Mr. Mallock shows very clearly that no one form of Protestantism, or any combination of its sects, has any final authority to which it can appeal against the teachings of historical or demonstrative sciences. This, no doubt, is true, but we should go further and urge that no authority whatever can set aside or overrule the conclusions of science—for the good reason that science means discovered and verified truth. Hence, the theological speculations of the world are outside the domain of demonstrated science, because its pretensions cannot be verified by reason and experience. Of course, the authority of science may be disputed, or its conclusions may be rejected; but that would not destroy the authority itself.

In stating his principal thesis Mr. Mallock says: "I shall endeavor to show that, if the Christian religion holds its own at all in the face of secular knowledge, it is the Christian religion as embodied in the Church of Rome, and not in any form of Protestantism, that will survive in the intellectual contest." He then proceeds to show how modern knowledge has affected the foundations of the Protestant and Catholic bodies respectively. The new knowledge is classified by him under two heads—the cosmic and the historical. The first-named science—which, according to him, bears "on the relations of man to the matter of which this planet is formed, and the relation of this planet to the solar system, and to the universe,"—may "be set aside," because it equally affects all views of Christianity without distinction. There is, however, it is urged, this difference between this science and the teachings of the Christian faith. The former reduces man to insignificance, "whereas it is the essence of Christianity to invest it with some solemn and eternal import." But surely it must be evident to impartial thinkers that the old notion, that the universe was created for man's special benefit, has long been exploded. The vastness of the universe, and its effects on the nature and conduct of man, have completely revolutionized the old theological theories as to the origin and nature of the universe.

Mr. Mallock recognizes very clearly the changes and modifications which have marked the history of the Christian faith. He says:

"Christianity, as we look back over the nineteen centuries of its existence, will be seen to have passed through two similar, though contrasted, crises, greater and more momentous than any others that can be compared with them. The first of these was the ultimate and decisive victory which Christian theology gained over the secular thought of the ancient world. The second is the victory, no less decisive, which the secular thought of the modern world has gained over Christian theology. The first of these events is summed up in the words of the Emperor Julian: 'Thou hast conquered, O Galilean.' The second may be summed up in words which, willingly or unwillingly, the Church, then so triumphant, has had to utter to another teacher—words, almost identical: 'Thou hast conquered, O Galileo.' The significance of this last confession it is impossible to over-estimate."

Doubtless this is so, but does it not deteriorate the value of the Catholic, as well as of the Protestant, Church, as an authority? We think so; for, despite its assumed infallibility, the Catholic Church, in its conflict with science, has been hopelessly defeated. Hence we can

add the third exclamation: O Science, thou hast conquered, and we believe that thou wilt remain the victor for all time!

In dealing with the science of history, Mr. Mallock hits Protestant Christianity exceedingly hard. He says: "Historical science tends to annihilate completely, in the eyes of every thinking man, the two great principles which are the foundation of what is called Reformed Christianity." These principles he describes as being the inerrancy of the Bible and the arguments based upon the beliefs and practices of Christ's earliest followers. Of these he frankly writes: "Both these principles the scientific study of history is rendering, year by year, more completely untenable—indeed, we may say more completely unthinkable. Whilst increasing the interest of the Bible in many respects, it is exhibiting the Biblical books as utterly incompetent, in themselves, to supply us with any system of coherent doctrine, or to prove it. Whilst increasing the interest of the history of the Christian Church, it is showing us that the Christianity of Protestantism, no less than that of Rome, is, instead of being primitive, the gradual growth of centuries." Here is another of those justifications of the Freethought position towards the Bible and Christianity which modern thought and critical examination are constantly furnishing. The alleged truth of the Bible, which at one time was implicitly believed in, is no longer recognized by the more intelligent adherents of the Christian faith; and the old notions of primitive Christianity have entirely changed. We cannot but welcome these transformations, as they afford unmistakable evidence of the force of Secular philosophy. It would be interesting to read what the intelligent and respectable members of the Christian Evidence Society have to say of these acknowledged instances of the decay of "the faith which was once delivered unto the saints."

Noticing the important confession that science has triumphed over the Christian forces, Mr. Mallock points out "that in the eyes of the very Church itself. . . . science has established its position as the sole and final authority with regard to all subjects amenable to its methods and apprehension; and that the question which now confronts us is not, as it was once, whether theology can find room for science, but whether science can find room for theology. It is for Christianity, not for science, to give this question its answer." Supposing Christianity could give the answer, it would, if based upon facts, be in the negative. Science, as such, has nothing to do with the speculations of theology. The former, as we have already mentioned, represents verified facts, while the latter is a record of conjectures. The one deals with the realities of this life, but the other refers to hopes and fears pertaining to a future existence, if there be one. The value of the one can be tested in time; the truth of the other can only be decided; if at all, in what is termed eternity.

But another question arises. Assuming "that the Christian religion is a religion which may be true possibly, our sole question here is whether, in the face of advancing knowledge, men can any longer believe it to be true actually." To this we reply that, whatever Mr. Mallock intended his article to have proved, the facts which he gives amply show, in our opinion, that the alleged truths of the Christian religion are thoroughly refuted by the scientific criticism of modern times.

Mr. Mallock clearly shows that science has effected an entire change in the intellectual conceptions of the Bible. The belief that it contains "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth," has been completely annihilated, and, in its place, "science has forced on us the

recognition that, whatever truths the Biblical books may contain, these truths are embedded in a mass of error in legends pretending to be history, in reminiscences pretending to be prophecies, and in the frequent inculcation of conduct not only immoral, but monstrous." This revolutionary process has resulted in the teachings of the Bible being judged, not by the standpoint of an imaginary "divine authority," but by their adaptability to human needs. In other words, the Jewish and Christian Scriptures are now estimated upon precisely the same principle as are any other writings.

That this revolution is a reality Mr. Mallock proves by referring to such prominent Christian Apologists as Canon Gore, the Dean of Canterbury, and Professor Harnack. Canon Gore really admits "that science has so revolutionized our conception of what the Bible is as to force us to defend its inspiration on practically new grounds." In justification of this new departure he quotes the Bishop of Oxford, who, in a recent charge, declared that "the Holy Scriptures of the New Testament are now going through a process of analytical criticism" which "is effecting a change in our conception of what the Bible is, which, if not greater, is certainly not less than 'the changes involved in the acceptance of heliocentric astronomy.'" Dean Farrar avows "that the Bible, from Genesis to Revelation, is a mixture of truth and error; that the view, so prevalent formerly, according to which it was a book demanding in all its facts our credence, or even our respect, would, if not abandoned by Christians, reduce their religion to an absurdity; and that the foremost duty of the modern Christian Apologist is to show the sceptic and the infidel that Christians are concerned to defend, not the book as a whole, but select passages only." And Professor Harnack says: "The most decisive step of all [in religious thought] was taken when it was agreed that the understanding and exposition of the Old and New Testaments were neither to be regulated by any 'creed,' nor be allowed, out of regard for the sacredness of the text, to make use of other methods than those universally recognized in the spheres of philology and history. The application of this rule to theology has produced a revolution which still vibrates through the whole of its domain."

Thus we have, upon the testimony of three of the most prominent Bible exponents of modern times, frank admissions that the Bible is no longer regarded as the infallible guide it was once supposed to be. This is an important advance in Freethought, inasmuch as it destroys the notion of Bible supremacy, which has always been an impediment to the progress of mental freedom. It is true that these Christian Apologists contend that portions of the Bible are inspired; but this applies, as the Dean of Canterbury admits, to "select passages only." We are informed that "all the rest—and the rest is a large portion of it—we may abandon, as unconcernedly as we might abandon the books of Livy, to the secular critic, who may destroy or spare it as he pleases." The damaging point here to the Christian position is, Who shall decide what is "inspired" and what is not? The materials for such a decision are not furnished by the Bible itself. It must, therefore, be left to the readers of the book to say what is the word of God and what is the word of man. But conclusions so arrived at will rest solely upon personal opinions, which are as varied as they are liable to be erroneous. We therefore agree with Mr. Mallock that logically but one conclusion can be arrived at. "That conclusion is this: That the Bible, taken by itself, is no guide to true Christianity [whatever that term means], and affords no proof that such-and-such doctrines are true."



So much for the Bible itself when it is confronted with modern criticism. It will not be difficult to show that the teachings which Protestants allege are based upon the Bible are equally defective as a guide, and that they are so indefinite in their nature, and so varied in their influence, that it seems almost impossible for the numerous Christian sects to discover that there is any harmonious meaning attached to them. This is so evident that the Rev. G. F. Terry says: "The great problem which confronts the religious world of to-day may be briefly stated thus; How shall the Church preserve her own past, and yet, at the same time, meet the wants of the present? How can she hold the faith delivered to the saints of bygone ages, and, at the same time, find room for the faith delivered to the saints of to-day? We feel that the two contrary elements of fixity and change must be harmonized in order to fit the religion of Jesus for future needs. How this is to be done is not yet apparent. Of one thing only can we be certain—that history and not authority, fact and not fiction, will determine the form of Christianity in the future" (*Church Gazette*, November 25). No, it is not "yet apparent" how the changes produced by scientific investigation can be brought into harmony with a faith which is said to be the same "yesterday, to-day, and forever." And herein lies the folly of trying to regulate human affairs at the present time by rules claimed to have been fixed two thousand years ago. As Dr. Magee once said, "It is impossible to run a State on the principle of the Sermon on the Mount."

The oft-repeated boast of professed Christians, that, notwithstanding their differences upon doctrines, etc., they have an authority to which all can appeal, is entirely fallacious. And, so far as Protestants are concerned, Mr. Mallock proves this up to the hilt. We have already seen that the Bible does not furnish such an authority. Where, then, is it to be found? Not in the Articles of the Church of England, for Nonconformists will not accept them as being of any authoritative value. Not in Councils, for Protestants, as a rule, will not admit that they are infallible. Not in what the Dean of Canterbury terms "the verifying faculty of the Christian consciousness," for, as the Dean admits, "the most grotesquely opposite conclusions" are drawn from individual study. In the absence of any definite authority it is not surprising to find, as Professor Harnack grants, that scientific criticism has destroyed the "belief in three things—the miraculous birth of Christ, his resurrection, and his ascension." Well might Mr. Mallock exclaim: "What shall we say, then, of the claim that any living authority is present with the Protestant Church which preserves Christian doctrine intact amid the critical storm, when the very men who are most eager to put this authority forward are found to be contradicting each other with regard to the very rudiments of the faith which this authority imposes upon them, and cannot agree that it imposes on them even a belief in the resurrection of their Lord?"

The view taken by Mr. Mallock, that, admitting the credibility of the Christian religion, the position of the Roman Catholic Church is the consistent one, is, we think, sound. As Mr. Edward Clodd states: "By those who accept it [Revelation], the fact should not be blinked that there is no logical standpoint short of entering her communion." But as we do not grant the credibility claimed, we are opposed to the assumptions of both Catholic and Protestant, and look upon each as attempts to pander to human credulity, and to perpetuate theological errors at the sacrifice of reason and common sense.

"Vengeance Is Mine, I Will Repay, Saith the Lord."

THE *Church Standard* of Philadelphia makes this wise comment on the complaints of outrages on Christian missionaries in "heathen" countries, which come daily and numerously to the State Department from the missionaries themselves and from the secretaries of the societies sending them out:

"It would seem that comparatively few such letters ought to be written and that many indignities should be silently borne. Indeed, we may go further and admit that there is much force in the contention of the Rev. J. Hudson Taylor of the China Inland Mission that in the long run appeals to home governments work nothing but harm. His testimony was that he had known of many riots that had never been reported and of much suffering endured by missionaries in silence, which had 'fallen out rather to the furtherance of the Gospel.' 'If we leave God to vindicate our cause,' he said, 'the issue is sure to prove marvellous in spirituality.'"

Christian missionaries who go to countries of other religions long established, with a view to upsetting them as false and delusive, in favor of Christianity as the only true and really Divine religion, must expect to encounter hardships. Of course, they are regarded as interlopers, as "carpet-baggers." They are intruders, according to the notions of the countries they would proselyte, and are regarded with aversion always and everywhere, and no less in Christendom than in "heathendom." When, for instance, during the height of the anti-slavery agitation in this country Englishmen came over here to denounce our slavery they were roughly treated as pestilent interlopers even by people who had no love for the "peculiar institution," as it was then called euphemistically. Reformers from abroad have usually met with that fate. They are told in language not polite that they had better stay at home and mind their own business. How we treat foreigners to whom we object was illustrated recently in the outrages against Chinamen and their eventual exclusion from this country. A great political party, the Know-Nothing party, was gathered here about fifty years ago out of pure opposition to foreigners and more specifically those of the Roman Catholic Church.

Thus, we see, our own skirts are not at all clear in this matter; and even now a systematic attempt to proselyte this country by foreign Mohammedans or Buddhists, for instance, would be resisted by ridicule, if not violence; and especially would there be uproar if the Governments of which the missionaries were citizens or subjects should undertake to protect them by hostile demonstrations.

The most unfortunate and inconsistent incident of the Christian missionary enterprise is such appeal to Government protection. It has associated Christianity with violent foreign aggression in the minds of the peoples of countries to which the missionaries have gone. Instead of leaving "God to vindicate our cause," as the missionary above quoted consistently advises, appeals for vindication are made to the "civil arm," and the result, instead of proving "marvellous in spirituality," has been to stir up bad blood and bring disgrace to Christianity.

Christian missionaries do not go forth on the theory that people of other religions are to be forced violently into Christianity, but that they are to be won, persuaded, convinced to adopt it as the true and merciful faith. They occupy a position in which, naturally, they are exposed to indignities produced by misconceptions of their purposes, but they must bear them as inevitably

incident to their peculiar enterprise. Treatment against which an ordinary traveller, minding his own business in a foreign country, might reasonably protest to his Government should be borne uncomplainingly by Christian missionaries who are in the country for the special purpose of interfering with its established customs and traditions concerning the one subject which everywhere awakens the strongest prejudice and the most passionate feeling of humanity. —*New York Sun.*

#### THE PAGAN QUESTIONING DEATH.

O mist of night and blindness, that must hang  
Before the life to come!  
O tomb that closes once with iron clang,  
And is forever dumb!

Ships which go forth upon the boundless main  
And perish far at sea,  
Are tossed in fragments to the land again—  
But not returns from thee.

No whisper comes from all the generations,  
Through the dark portals thrust;  
No breath of life among the buried nations  
One moment stirs their dust.

No soul beneath, e'er struggling into sight,  
Heaves up the silent ground;  
Though the green sod above them is so light—  
So frail the crumbling mound.

I listen by the sea to catch some tone  
From spirits that are fled;  
There is no voice in its eternal moan—  
No voice of all its dead.

The stars look coldly down when man is dying,  
The moon still holds its sway,  
Flowers breathe their perfume round us: winds keenly  
sighing;  
Naught seems to pause or stay.

Yes! blindly on—o'er all that thinks and feels  
The universe must roll;  
Though at each turn its adamant wheels  
Crush cut a human soul!

Toward yon bright vault of heaven I dare not raise  
The cry of my despair,  
Lest I should hear the echo which betrays  
That all is empty there.

Yet has my soul within the gift of seeing  
Beyond this earth and sky;  
I feel the immortal instinct of my being—  
I know it cannot die!

—*Quoted from Flaneur, Toronto Mail.*

#### "PEACE ON EARTH, GOODWILL TO MEN."

The domestic unhappiness arising from difference of belief was probably almost or altogether unknown in the world before the introduction of Christianity. . . . The deep and widening chasm between the religious opinions of the most highly-educated men and of the immense majority of women is painfully apparent. —*Lecky.*

It may prove useful to have learnt from history the elementary lesson that no opinion is true simply because it has been held by the greatest intellects, or by the largest number of human beings, at different periods in the history of the world. —*Max Muller.*

#### A Corpse Transmogrified.

BY M. C. O'BRYEN.

THERE is not the least necessity for "any pious Christians" to "look up the story of Paul and Agrippa, to see how it tallies with the newly-discovered letters," etc. (See *SECULAR THOUGHT* of May 12.) It is really astounding, however, to observe, how rapidly and certainly the popularization of what is termed Education is increasing the number of omadhauns on the American continent. The interesting narrative,—originated in New York,—of the discovery of a tablet containing a literary correspondence conducted by Jesus of Nazareth and "King Agrippa" is nothing more than an old lie mutilated almost beyond recognition, except by experts. For King Agrippa read Prince (*Dunastes*) Abgarus, of Edessa, and then find, in the thirteenth chapter of the first book of Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History, the complete narrative of an infamous Christian fraud.

Life is too short for even the critical Don Quixote to tilt against the dead giants of ancient imposture thus ludicrously strapped on horseback and sent avorting down the lists of the American press. "A wicked doer giveth heed to false lips, and a liar giveth ear to a naughty tongue," which is probably the reason why the free and independent citizens of the Republic whose "Father" would not lie to escape a whipping are always so eager to qualify themselves for prominent positions "in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone," and to welcome every Pseudochrist that presents himself. Two years ago the papers,—whose Christian zeal is most unremitting,—even went so far as to print fac-similes of a portion of the "Gospel of Peter," found in an Egyptian tomb. This they did to clinch for ever the "cumulative evidences" of the truth of Christianity, with characteristic republican indifference to the fact, recognized even among primitive Christians, that this so-called gospel was an impudent "heterodox" forgery, whose probable author was the infamous forger Leucius. ("Evangelium Petri fuisse reor figmentum Leucii haeretici, seculo secundo, plura ejusmodi eudentis, oque nominibus apertolorum supponentis," are the words of the learned Grabe, written in 1698 and assented to by later scholars.)

In justice to a long line of erudite Christians, it is right to brand that this malodorous Abgarus forgery was first branded as such by men of undoubted orthodoxy. "Epistola Jesus ad Abgarum Regem apocrypha" are the words of condemnation used by the council of Rome in the time of Pope Gelasius, anno 496. I will not insult the intelligence of the reader by observing that if a hundred tablets containing these letters were discovered it would not alter the character of the fraud. Nothing is more likely than that the Edessans,—a people so superstitious that their city held three hundred monasteries early in the fourth century,—would do their utmost to perpetuate a story so well calculated to gratify their local pride and their religious imbecility. One is at a loss, however, to understand why the American newspapers are so warmly interested in resurrecting these old putridities. On this line of development the time will soon come when every editorial desk will have its reliquary, enshrining pieces of finger nails, knuckle bones, and relics of parthenical sacrifice.

#### CHRISTIANITY AND SLAVERY.

In all ancient Christian literature there is not one word that tells the slave to revolt, or that tells the master to liberate the slave, or even that touches the problem of public right which arises out of slavery. —*Renan.*

## Ingersoll's Influence.

BY MARY F. LANG, F.T.S.

THE reply of Dr. Henry M. Field to the question of the *Review*, concerning Robert G. Ingersoll's influence in the future is, on many accounts, extraordinary. It certainly in no degree expresses the view held by Ingersoll's friends.

Dr. Field says: "When a man dies who has been for a long time at the head of a party in politics or religion, it is natural to think that his party may die with him. In no case could this seem more probable than in the sudden death of the brilliant and defiant leader of Agnostics in this country. He is gone, and we cannot but ask ourselves whether his scattered followers will rally round some new leader, or be so demoralized that they can only wrap their cloaks around them and fall with dignity." This sounds well, but the facts do not warrant the rhetoric.

Robert G. Ingersoll was not at the head of anything like a religious or Agnostic party, and his "scattered followers" have something more enduring than the personality of a leader to which to give their allegiance.

He was the last man living to say to any other, "Follow me," or "Believe what I tell you." His dependence—his weapon—his shield—his torch, was logic. His supreme object in life was to lay bare the want of logic of the orthodox creeds, and by so doing to liberate the minds of people from dogmatism.

The magnetism of his splendid courage gave him the attitude of leadership. It was this, even more than his ability, that brought him to the front. Where was there another man who dared say the things he dared to say?

His "followers"—by which objectionable word Dr. Field probably means the persons who found logic resistless—were not of the class who accept authority for truth: they were, rather, discarding authority. His audiences were made up of people who think, and, with few exceptions, of people who began to think before they ever heard Ingersoll lecture. The question of his influence cannot be summarily and arbitrarily settled by the statement that he left no Agnostic party. All of the people who thronged to hear him were neither incipient Agnostics nor Atheists. There were all sorts and conditions of men and of minds in his audiences. They represented every shade of liberal thought. There were those who had experienced the inner revolt against the old doctrines from every conceivable cause. Many had found them illogical and therefore untrue; many found them unscientific and therefore untrue; others found them inspiritual and therefore untrue. To reject them does not argue oneself irreligious. One may be devoutly religious, and not believe in infant damnation; profoundly spiritual, yet not in harmony with the teaching of original sin; one may cling to a faith in God, yet it need not be a personal God, who, solely for his own glory, predestines some men and angels to everlasting life, and foreordains others to everlasting death.

The people "heard him gladly." They found his arguments logical and scientific; they found him honest and courageous. A certain proportion agreed with his Agnosticism, but Edmund Burke was doubtless right in declaring that "all men that are ruined are ruined on the side of their natural propensities," and he never made an Agnostic out of any one who was not so naturally. Nor could he ever make a materialist out of one to whom the "Inner Light" had shown itself, although that

one would just as surely be convinced of the redundancy of creed and dogma.

Dr. Field analyses Ingersoll's character, and decides that he was a man who loved his friends and hated his enemies; that he cared neither for time nor money; that he was generous to the degree of bad judgment; that he looked with equal pity on the poor and the criminal, and that he was one of the greatest orators that our country ever produced.

But all of this—he truthfully adds—is not the real test, and asks, what wisdom had he? What have unbelievers ever done for the world? Among unbelievers he quotes Tyndall, and as proof of Tyndall's unbelief, quotes his statement that "in matter could be found the promise and potency of all life," a statement that, to one less a materialist than Dr. Field, is a recognition of the immanence of God! But Dr. Field satirically adds, "What need, then, of a Creator over our heads, when we have a creative power under our feet?" "One after another," he says, "the advocates of Atheism find the ground sinking under their feet, while in their place come the great men of science—Newton, Faraday, Kelvin—and against such authorities no glittering theories make any impression." Right here it might be well to ask what were Ingersoll's "glittering theories?"

In closing he says: "This makes an end, so far as I can see, of the fear or the hope that the followers of Ingersoll, feeling deeply, as well they may, the loss to them by death, should make an organized body of Agnostics, not only to preserve his memory, but to perpetuate his belief or unbelief."

Belief or unbelief, with thinking people, does not begin nor end with the life or death of any one else. And evidently Dr. Field does not realize a fact that has become a matter of conviction to many, namely—that the shortest way to render a belief short-lived is to tie it up with an inelastic string called "party," label it "organization," and declare that here alone is absolute truth! Agnostics have learned this from theologians!

The conclusion of Dr. Field, then, is that the influence of Ingersoll is at an end.

That Ingersoll was fighting dogmas that were obsolete, as is often charged, is certainly a mistake. There still are persons who are afraid to "give up hell," as one expressed it to me not long since, and we still, in enlightened communities, hear conservative sermons on matters of doctrine. It was because a prominent Congregational minister refused to endorse the whale story, that the Philadelphia Y.M.C.A., less than two years ago, excluded him from their lecture hall, which had been engaged for him by the Hicksite branch of the Society of Friends.

There is, however, no doubt but that there has been change and modification of the old attitude. The question then is,—to what or whom is this change due? We may thank Robert Ingersoll for much of it. I will go further and say that I believe that upon no one class of people has his influence been more telling than upon the ministers of the Gospel themselves.

Perhaps among all of the absurd and illogical dogmas which Ingersoll set himself to ventilate, none was to him more of an aggravation than that of "predestination," and so severe were his blows, and so cutting his ridicule, and so convincing his reasoning, that at last the church people themselves have begun to declare, "We do not believe it—no one believes it—it is a man of straw!"

At an early date in the history of the church, this doctrine became a cause of disquietude, but has held its own with only slight vicissitudes until within the last fifty years. "It is an

integral part of the Westminster Confession, which is the standard of devotion of the Presbyterian Church, and which is held by many Congregationalists as expressing the substance of Christian doctrine." (Washington Gladden.)

Against this teaching, with its concomitant of infant damnation, Ingersoll directed all the forces of his wit, his satire, his logic. The debate between himself and Dr. Field, which took place in the pages of the *Review* in '88 and '89, showed his gift of logical eloquence to the best advantage. These articles must have been read by many of the elect as well as the non-elect. They cannot fail to impress every one with the fact that the old doctrines, at which he struck such fearful blows, are cruel and illogical, and this whether the reader be orthodox or liberal, bond or free.

"Admit these things frankly," said Rev. Geo. Dowling, rector of Trinity Church, Toledo, in a Sunday morning sermon two years ago last December. "Admit these things frankly and honestly, as the great Biblical scholars with scarcely an exception are admitting them, and Robert Ingersoll and his ilk have lost their weapons. Deny them, and you simply fill the quivers with arrows." Here is a frank, manly acknowledgment from a man so broad for a Toledo pulpit, that Ingersoll was justified in attacking the teaching of the inerrancy of the Scriptures.

But the leaven is spreading. The *New York Sun*, less than a year ago, printed an article on the "Decline of Faith," in which it enumerated the various Presbyterian and Methodist churches in New York that were then torn by internal disquietude over their creeds. The article closes with the statement of Dr. Cadman, pastor of the Metropolitan Temple of New York, made before a great company of Methodist ministers, that "the absolute inerrancy and infallibility of the Bible are no longer possible of belief among reasoning men." The general opinion among the Methodist preachers to whom Dr. Cadman made the address was that the Bible needed editing. He was heartily applauded when he finished speaking.

It is only two years since Dr. John Watson (Ian Maclaren) was accused, tried and acquitted of heresy in a Presbyterian Synod in London, because, instead of the Westminster Confession of Faith, he offered the following, calling it a creed :

"I believe in the Fatherhood of God.

"I believe in the words of Jesus.

"I believe in the clean heart.

"I believe in the service of love.

"I believe in the unworldly life.

"I believe in the Beatitudes.

"I promise to trust God and follow Christ, to forgive my enemies and to follow after the righteousness of God."

Many Presbyterian divines in England and the United States were interviewed as to their opinion of this creed, and nearly all agreed that it was quite inadequate. Lyman Abbott (Congregationalist), Dr. Harrower (Methodist), Dr. Faunce, (Baptist), were among the few who approved it. Pres. Eliot, of Harvard, said it would "do very well to use in connection with historical creeds." A sort of theological appetizer, to give zest to the strong meat of infant damnation and original sin!

And not many years ago, at a meeting of the Presbytery in Cincinnati, at which revision of the Confession was discussed, protracted and solemn arguments were exchanged on the subject of whether infants dying in infancy are ever elect. One minister, Dr. Chidlaw, wanted the section relating to the damnation of infants revised so that mothers need not worry about

it. To this Dr. Scott replied that he did not want a creed that was a mother's comfort; he wanted a historical monument, and gave notice that he should vote against all motions to amend or revise. By a vote of 29 to 13, the amendment finally carried, and in that Presbytery they were committed to favoring the concession that "All infants dying in infancy, and other elect persons are saved."

Unfortunately, they have left us in doubt as to what becomes of infants in other Presbyteries, as well as of those in their own who died before this revision. It is a sweetly consoling thought, however, that parents who want their infants saved can move to Cincinnati.

In all this discussion there was constantly and apparently conscientious effort to determine what had been the intent of the original framers of the Confession, but no reference whatever to any possible opinion God might have on the subject. The deliberations and conclusions of this august body called forth a little rhyme, which went the rounds of the papers. It was called :

"JOHN CALVIN AND THE UNSELECTED INFANT.

"An unselected infant sighed out its little breath,  
And wandered in the darkness along the shores of death,  
Until the gates of heaven gleamed with pearls it spied—  
And ran to them—and clung—and would not be denied!  
But still from earth rose mutterings: 'You cannot enter in!  
Depart into Gehenna, you child of wrath and sin!  
At last the gates were opened. A man with features mild  
Stumped down and raised the weeping, unselected child.  
Immortal light thrilled down the avenues of bliss,  
And on the infant's forehead the spirit placed a kiss.  
'Who are you—thus to hallow my unselected brow?'  
'Dear child, my name was Calvin, but I see things better now!'"

Yet one need not look far to discover the fact that even with the more favorable conditions now accompanying church membership, it is necessary to offer attendants a premium on the pure and unadulterated Gospel. In connection with a Y.M.C.A. prayer service in a certain church in an Ohio city not long since, there was displayed on the outer wall an alluring placard, bearing the legend :

"Good music!

Ice cool lemonade!

Electric fans!"

And now comes Dr. John Watson, whose creed, two years ago, was too broad for the rank and file of orthodoxy, and protests in a recent article against what he calls the "Candypull system in the churches." He suggests that if this state of things continues another kind of a minister will be needed—not an expounder of the Bible, or a trainer of human souls, but a "manager." "But," he says, "the church should pause before it decides to give over the pulpit to managers."

To what, then, is due the very great change in public opinion in the last twenty years? Probably to no one force and influence so much as that of Robert G. Ingersoll. "Followers" of Ingersoll would be hard to find, if that means persons who endorse all he ever said and did. Yet it would be equally hard to find any one who has in no way felt his influence. The man or woman who could read his speech on the Chinese Immigration bill or his lecture on the Liberty of Man, Woman and Child, or his contribution to the Reminiscences of Abraham Lincoln, or his lecture on Shakespeare, or his tribute to his dead brother, and not be quickened to higher and nobler thought and aspiration, must indeed be difficult to arouse! And who, having recognized in him the "Great Companion," struggling with tireless energy to bring freedom to his fellow men, can feel for one moment that with his death his influence

is at an end! He produced his effects where effects are lasting—on men's minds—the theatre where the drama of evolution is a reality.

He did not accomplish *all* the change in sentiment of which we now reap the result, but was the pioneer who voiced it, when it was unpopular. There were few, twenty years ago, to express sympathy for the criminal, few to say that crime is the result of ignorance, few to preach an unvarying substitution of love in exchange for hate.

Dr. Field seems wholly blind to the fact that Ingersoll was anything more than "a brilliant and defiant agnostic." He fails utterly to see in him a strong, self-reliant soul, whose mission was to clear away the relics of a most material theology, and thus open the way for a later influx of spiritual thought. This Ingersoll could not have done, had he been at all a different man to what he was. As it was, with all his iconoclasm, he preached a doctrine of love that put to blush the vindictiveness of theology.

What have unbelievers done for humanity?

The list of "unbelievers" is a long one if it is to include, as it reasonably must, all who have protested against dogma. It must include many a martyr who has given his life for truth—many a scientist who, as he gained a broader conception of God, was forced to "cease from his god of tradition." It must include all who appreciate the value of an honest doubt as compared with a blind illogical faith—all whose inspired works have strengthened the protests of the few against the wicked intolerance of the many—all who have helped humanity to realize that Truth alone can make them free—all who take arms against injustice, and declare that every man is here as "divinely" as every other.

"In all the realms of art, poetry and science," says Elbert Hubbard, "no man who stood in the front rank has ever been an orthodox Protestant. At the grave of Oliver Wendell Holmes, Edward Everett Hale stated that the six great poets of America were Unitarian in faith. Challenged for the statement, he afterward reiterated it, and said that no great poet, artist, inventor, writer or scientist had ever lived, who believed in the five points of Calvinism."

Ingersoll's influence is not at an end. There will be no Agnostic party formed—no fanatical body of persons banded together calling themselves his "followers," for the Christian world, permeated, by every phase of liberal thought, as it is to-day, has no need of this. But as the world grows interiorly bigger, as the people come more and more into possession of their birthright—Truth—there will be a larger appreciation of his work, a fuller recognition of the soul who came among us to serve the cause of intellectual and religious freedom.

## Bicycles and Churches.

BY M. C. O'BYRNE, LA SALLE, ILL.

THE population of Chicago is estimated at two millions. Of course this includes the residents of a dozen or more suburban villages which relatively are to Chicago proper in about the same position as are Kingston, Uxbridge, Watford, Barnet and Waltham to the capital of England. In its haste to eclipse New York as the biggest thing in America, Chicago has "buncomed and buncoed" all the prairie farmers within a radius of twenty miles or so into local citizenship, thus rendering it possible for the civic corn-gambler at the Board of Trade building

to corner and bull and bear concurrently with the planting hoeing, and husking of his brother townsman far out on the wind-swept veldt of the suburbs. Of these two millions of people 861,152 are said to be duly labelled as members of definite religious denominations, 600,000 being fortunate enough to belong to the Roman Catholic communion, whereby they are warranted against algo-phrenomany, a malady arising from doubts on the subject of the true church and what one must do to be saved.

At the apex or capstone of the obelisk which represents Chicago's denominational differentiations we find the word "miscellaneous." Among the too-small-to-be-classified congregations included in this category is one known as All Souls', a designation reminiscent of Hallowe'en and suggestive of purgatorial masses. This is an "independent" church, which means that both pastor and congregation are bound by no creeds or confessions, tied to no catechisms, whether longer or shorter, ready and willing to extend the hand of fellowship to any man, without inquiring too closely if he calls his fetish Jehovah, Jove, or Lord. Living on the ghost of old religion, it would seem difficult for any man long to occupy the position of minister or pastor to so heteroclitic an association, unless as an ethical teacher his qualifications be so high that he can afford to dispense with psalm-singing and the mummery of "divine worship" altogether. Generally speaking, the independent pastor is a franc tireur or bashi bazuok, free to criticize and, if need be, to condemn the methods and teachings of more orthodox ministers from the standpoint of a brother laborer, and therefore without disturbing the elements as they are agitated when the "infidel" speaks. For, be it noted, your independent pastor is still an esoteric, an epopt, an initiate, not to be lightly regarded as a layman. Though more or less nondescript, he is

"One whom the mob, when next we find or make  
A Popish plot, shall for a Jesuit take,  
And the wise Justice, starting from his chair,  
Cry: 'By your priesthood, tell me what you are!'"

I fear this is rather a lengthy introduction to the subject proper of this paper, which is a discovery made and publicly announced (in a recent sermon) by the minister of the aforesaid independent church. According to this gentleman, "Religion in our day seems to be dying out. The bicycle is a successful competitor with the church, while women's clubs were a greater attraction than the house of God." Surely, if this be true, the bicycle has suppeditated and become a potent factor in a mighty revolution whose end no man may venture to foretell. The memory of man and the records of his life story do not extend back to an era wherein we do not find him strapped Ixion-like to the cruel wheel of religion, continuously alternating between the zenith and the nadir of mind-perverting terrors and hopes as baseless as the quicksand. And now, if we may presume to mix our metaphors a little, the serpent-wheel itself is something "*quem arca obliquam rota transit*"—an evil thing which a brazen wheel has passed over sideways, and while passing has very much disfigured. We know and can appreciate the five causes advanced by the great historian for the triumph of Christianity over Paganism; our reason assures us that they are efficient and commensurate; but to what undignified straits, what distressful *lesa dignitatis* will the coming historian of the decline and fall of Christendom be reduced who can sum it all up in one word—Bicycle! Instead of a grand mausoleum, carrying entablatures covered

with the effulgent record of centuries of philanthropic activity, a demise so inglorious should fittingly be remembered by this epitaph on a lichen-eaten headstone in the most secluded corner of the world's great cemetery :

"Here lies, cold as an icicle,  
BIBLE RELIGION, killed by a bicycle :  
"Afflictions sore long time he bore,  
Physicians were in vain ;  
For the pneumatic tire hath sent him up higher,  
And cured him of his pain."

Wanting data, and being more or less gloriously uncertain with regard to facts and their differentiation from fables, many old-world historians have at all times been sorely puzzled and perplexed. This applies solely to the secular annalist. Your Christ-biographer and ecclesiastical historian have never experienced much difficulty in making one or two half-truths serve as foundation for a huge structure of inventions. Bicycles and women's clubs are, however, substantial verities, both proper to the nineteenth century in its later decades, so that the coming historian will find his task comparatively easy. And since,—a hundred critical gadflies notwithstanding,—Gibbon's fifteenth and sixteenth chapters still remain as the standard of impartial history as envisaged by the philosopher, the coming historian can scarcely do better than take it as his model, in which event his exordium may be something like this :

"Our curiosity is naturally prompted to inquire by what means the Christian faith was so speedily and tranquilly disavowed and subverted in the twentieth century after the supposed birth of the half-mythical child whom superstition exalted into a deity. To this inquiry an obvious and satisfactory answer may be returned : that it was owing to the invention and rapid popularization of a cheap and ready means of locomotion, from whose advantages few, if any, were debarred, and to the adoption by woman of a medium of promoting that social intercourse which has ever been so dear to her heart, and by which the recognition of her mental, moral, and social equality with man has been so satisfactorily and universally assisted."

Taking this as his base, our historian will proceed to explain that the bicycle was the main factor in introducing the inhabitants of cities to a grander temple than any ever made by human hands, of familiarizing them with the ritual of rivulet, forest, and the songs of birds, and the perennial incense of flower-perfumed breezes freighted with the richest ozone from ocean and mountain-top. He will show how rapidly man, so long divorced from Nature, learned to love the "sweet mother," while,—as Matthew Arnold so grandly sings,—

"She to him will reach her hand,  
And gazing in his eyes will stand,  
And know her friend and weep for gloe,  
And cry : 'Long, long I've looked for thee.'"

He will demonstrate, moreover, that woman, mainly by her own unaided determination, effected her own emancipation from the divine-incarnation doctrine which for so many ages induced, and often compelled, her to sacrifice chastity of body and freedom of will to the lecherous brutes who regarded her as an unhallowed vehicle for the gratification of their lowest passions. And it may well be that by means of the art-preservative (printing) the very words of the independent Chicago minister may be used to show that in the last year of the nineteenth century there were 1,128,848 persons out of a population of two millions, in one American city, who made absolutely no profession of religious belief, and from this he will

logically conclude,—as we ourselves should do,—that even then the majority of the American people were not Christian even in name.

Take courage, therefore, all ye who are spending and being spent in the cause of intellectual redemption ! Be of good cheer ! for the people are not quite so obtuse as sometimes ye have deemed them to be. At least, they are not pledged to the shibboleth of any form of superstition ; in due time they will come to the light, and that, too, all the surer because neither taboo nor excommunication can be placed upon their rational enjoyments. In the field of wise and healthy pleasure reason has her strongest ally.

### Piety up to Date.

ENGLAND is much richer in holy hoax than she was only quite recently. The source of England's greatness has been augmented. Cardinal Vaughan has received for the new Westminster Cathedral three large particles of the Crown of Thorns, worn by "Our Lord." These particles were presented to Pius IX. by a member of the royal family of Piedmont. After the death of that Pope, they were given to Mr. H. Grissell by the then Cardinal Vicar of Rome, and by him duly authenticated ; he found them to be the very thorns—three of Jesus Christ's hairs sticking to them, and a segment of the halo. It is intended to place these relics in one of the chapels of the Westminster Cathedral.

There are certain other relics which Cardinal Vaughan has not yet received ; but, if he go on, prayerfully, he will receive them in Heaven's own good time and way. These will, I presume, comprise two intensely sacred relics referred to by Burns, *viz* :

That which distinguished the gender,  
O' Balaam's ass ;  
The broomstick o' the Witch o' Endor,  
Weel shod wi' brass.

I should think the talking-ass, that also prays and brays and brans incense, has still a good deal to distinguish its gender, or Cardinal Vaughan and his like would very shortly find his occupation gone. It is always the lower types and the block-heads that are so racially prolific. John Stuart Mill had no progeny, but not so General Booth and his gang. Herbert Spencer has been fertile in books, but sterile in bairns. A certain very despicable insect—the hero or one of the Egyptian Plagues—can become a grandfather in twenty-four hours. A follower of Vaughan or Booth is not quite so fecundly expeditious : still he leaves the philosopher far, far behind. And so there is a perennial crop of dupes to gape and fling pence at a bit of thorn, that, a few years ago, may have been growing in a hedge in Kent, if, indeed, it be fair to give it by hypothesis an origin so reputable.

Even under our very noses counterfeits and shams of all kinds, sacred and secular, are being faked up for the starving, paying masses of easily begotten, easily gulled humanity. A recent article in the *Chronicle* takes us behind the scenes and tells how illustrations of battles in South Africa, for instance, are made for the delectation of John and Janet Smith. Scattered all over Europe are manufactories of ancient relics which are sold to travellers. Coins, ceramics, medals, seals, anything and everything that human ambition would love to exhibit in homes, or in museums, even ancient mummies, are imitated. Manuscripts on every variety of subject are simulated to meet the market. Go in any direction and fraud is met with, save when "sacred literature" or "sacred relics," after they have been stealthily hidden, are found in some ruined monastery, or are exhumed in some old abbey. Such finds are always genuine, always inspirations of God, saved by special Providence for the benefit of the Church.

—*Agnostic Journal*.

SALADIN.