

**All Gone.**

Whar's my Adam 'n' Ebe?  
Make ol' nigga' b'lebe  
Warn't none? Preacher man say,  
"Story all done away."  
O my lamb!

Whar's my apple so red,  
Turned po' Missy Ebe's head!  
'N' de ol' sarpent? "All lies!"  
So say de preacher man wise.  
O my lamb!

Whar's my Jonah, dat groan  
In de whale's belly all 'lone?  
"Couldn't done dat way,"  
So de new preacher man say.  
O my lamb!

Dey take my apple, take my Ebe,  
Take my Adam 'n' snake dat deceibe,  
Take my Jonah, take my whale,  
Bust my 'ligion. Po' nigga' wail.  
O my lamb!

**Credless Liberalism.**

BY CYRUS W. COOLRIDGE.

Some advanced Liberals are of the opinion that Freethought as a negative doctrine belongs to the past, and that the present age needs Freethought in its constructive form. Now, to say that the negative side of Freethought is entirely useless is a mistake. The church is by no means dead, and Christian superstition is still alive. So long as our country is filled with orthodox churches, in which the bible is accepted as the infallible word of God, Freethought as a destructive force still has a great mission. But on the other hand, to say that Freethought in its negative form is all-sufficient, as many so-called Freethinkers claim, is a greater mistake than many of the "mistakes of Moses".

Let us imagine that we have succeeded in killing and burying the Christian religion; let us imagine that the priest's and the parson's occupation is gone, and that all the churches are vacant. Do you really think that the country would be benefitted by it? It is true that in many instances the churches are only social clubs; but even as such they are useful in a certain way. Take the rural districts, where the church is the only place that draws people together. What would our rural friends do without the church? They have no lecture halls or places of innocent amusement, and if you take away their church they will become unsocial beings and will care very little for each other. In order to cultivate a kind, fraternal feeling, people must have a common object in view. The church furnishes the object and thereby saves society from disintegration. True, the object of the church is based on a delusion, but if you destroy the church the people will be worse instead of better, unless you can give them something else that would take the place of the church.

Why do we want others to adopt our views? When we tell the Christian that Jehovah is a myth, born in the imagination of an ig-

norant people; that Christ, if he existed at all, was only a man, and that personal immortality is, to say the most, a guess—do we confer a favor upon him? Let us take the case of three men—Tom, Dick and Harry. They are ordinary human beings, not particularly good nor particularly bad. They are farmers and they work very hard in order to procure the means of subsistence. But on certain days they attire themselves in their best garments and go to their meeting place. They leave their every-day manners behind them and try to be gentle and polite to each other. Their faces are full of smiles; they exchange friendly greetings; they grasp each other's hands and feel that they are brothers. And why? Because they have a common bond; they are Christians, and they believe it is their duty to call people to Christ, and to save sinners from hell. They may be mistaken; their work may not be of the slightest use to the world, but they are doing their best according to their light. Now, what do you think these men will be doing if they become converted to the "glorious gospel" of negative Freethought? Why, they will not be doing anything. Sunday will be the same to them as Monday; there will be no occasion for their meetings and nothing to keep them together.

What, then, must we do to be saved? If we destroy Christianity, with its god, devil, savior, heaven and hell, we must infuse into the people an enthusiasm for humanity. But how can we do such a thing, when we ourselves lack enthusiasm? What are we Freethinkers doing? We talk, write and complain of the evils of the church. Is this enough? A credless Liberalism will never be of much value; it will never attract the masses. If humanity is to be saved here and now, let us save it. Let us prove by our lives and works that we are real lovers of mankind, and that our object is to make men happy. Let us in our private lives be superior to those whom we want to convert to our way of thinking; let us instruct and enlighten; let us work for better economic conditions, for a higher standard of morals, for free womanhood, for the rights of children to be born well, for temperance, peace and justice. Let us remember that unless we can be a constructive force for the betterment of mankind, Liberalism has no excuse for existence, and the sooner it dies the better for all concerned.—[Freethought Magazine.

I am convinced that the only faith that can save us is the belief in the efficacy of the accomplished effort. It is very beautiful to dream of eternity, but it is enough for the honest man to pass away, having done his task.—M. Zola.

**An Explanation.**

In the last issue of the Torch, we referred to the trouble the Liberals of Philadelphia have had with the anarchists and freelovers. The following letter from the secretary of the organization to the Truth-seeker will more fully explain matters:

"I notice in this week's issue that you have put in a notice stating that the Friendship Liberal League has moved to Industrial Hall, Broad and Wood streets. Now, it becomes my duty to make an explanation in this matter. In the first place, I desire to say that the Liberal League still holds forth every Sunday in the old quarters, 1710 North Broad street, both afternoon and evening. But there is a rupture in our ranks which has been threatening this past four months, and which has resulted in the anarchist and freelove element starting another branch, using the name of Friendship Liberal League. They have our president with them, one vice-president and one trustee. The remaining four trustees, three vice-presidents, the treasurer and secretary, are with the conservative element, and are still holding forth as before mentioned. Now, it seems very strange, and in fact a contradiction, that anarchists and freelovers (persons who do not believe in government) should be so desirous of seeking admission into membership of a society created by the state and a creature of law, for such is the Friendship Liberal League. More than once in my capacity as secretary of the League I have refused to cast the ballot making such persons members, and have been considered by some members an alarmist and not out of the orthodoxy of the state. And I may say here and now that while at one time in my life I had a tendency to favor philosophic anarchy, my experience of late with some of the acts of that class makes me more firmly convinced than ever of the necessity for government, for some of them will stop at nothing to gain their ends. While their own organs, such as Solidarity, Lucifer and Free Society, cry down government and majority rule (which is consistent with their principles), our Philadelphia ones have tried their best to capture our society by the very methods they condemn in government, thereby proving themselves recreant to their cause. The only paid lecturers that the League has engaged this season have been anarchist lecturers, and the rupture came to a focus now because the anarchist element of the League, by turning out in force, voted at a business meeting to have Mrs. Lucy Parsons lecture for the League. They carried their point that Sunday, but the conservative element, learning this, turned out on the following Sunday in greater num-

bers, and reconsidered the matter. Not to be outdone, however, the next Sunday the radicals turned out their full strength to attend the business meeting and undo what had been done. They came well prepared, with their suppers, or refreshments, as they might call it, with a view to worrying the meeting, so that a number left the hall in disgust, as well they might, for every ruling of the chair seemed to favor the anarchists, who kept the meeting in session from 4:30 p. m. to 7 p. m., and of course they had everything their own sweet way. The ruling of the chair was disgraceful and unparliamentary, but perfectly consistent with anarchy. They decided that Mrs. Parsons should come the following Sunday, but to their surprise, when the day came for her to appear, the hall was locked up, consequently there was no meeting in the afternoon. But the League held forth at night under police protection, our first vice-president taking the chair and keeping the meeting going as usual, as though nothing had happened.

"My letter is getting long, but before I close it I would like to give, as one of the evidences showing that the anarchists have been trying to capture the League for a propaganda of their views, an extract from Emma Goldman's report, in the March number of Solidarity, of her visit to Philadelphia. Here it is:

"The Friendship Liberal League of Philadelphia, for instance, has heretofore been controlled by its older members, who for twenty-five years have been killing God one night and reviving him the next, who have ceased to believe in a heavenly Lord, and yet have stood by while earthly lords were robbing the people. Even these pillars of society have been taught the lesson that the old order changes and gives way to the new. The comrades of Philadelphia, who arranged five meetings for me in the City of Brotherly Love, had a hard battle with these gentlemen, who had decided that no anarchist should speak from the platform of the League. The younger members, however, with our energetic comrades, won the victory, in spite of the strenuous opposition of the respectable element, etc. The comrades have sent reports to Free Society and other Liberal papers, so I will refrain from sending you the details."

"It need hardly be said that there is scarcely a word of truth in the above. The League has never decided that anarchists should not lecture; had it done so, Emma Goldman and other anarchist members would not have lectured of late as they have done. On the contrary, our laws allow freedom of discussion, but the League is decidedly opposed to paying out of its treasury money for anarchistic lectures, and to run the society in one particular channel. Yours for truth and justice,

"GEORGE LONGFORD, Sec."