

G5782  
200 MOS

**CHRISTIANITY:**  
**A Degrading Religion.**

BY

ARTHUR B. MOSS.

---

PRICE ONE PENNY.

---

LONDON:  
THE PROGRESSIVE PUBLISHING COMPANY,  
28 STONECUTTER STREET.

---

1884.

# CHRISTIANITY: A DEGRADING RELIGION.

By ARTHUR B. MOSS.

CHRISTIANITY is a degrading religion. Only mental slaves or moral cowards can accept it. A believer must begin by abandoning his reason, and end by shifting the burden of moral responsibility from his own to other shoulders.

Gautama, the founder of Buddhism, in stating his noble eightfold path to happiness, put first the acceptance of "right views." But, in order that a man should know what views are right, he must have freedom to think. Gautama saw this, and therefore urged his followers to inquire diligently after truth.

The founder of Christianity was not so wise. He cared not how stupid or thoughtless men were so long as they believed in him. In fact, he declared that he was "the way, the truth, and the life"; and that no man could be saved from the wrath of a merciful god but by accepting him. "Believe and be saved; disbelieve and be damned," was the foundation-stone of all his teachings.

In point of fact it came to this, that so arrogant and dogmatic was this peregrinating preacher that he led many to suppose that he was god almighty; and Christians today are driven into the position either of regarding Jesus as the very god, or of repudiating him altogether as an impostor. Some say that Jesus must have been a supernatural being, or he would not have made such bold pretensions. There was no hesitancy about him. He spoke as though he knew everything. But nearly all religious enthusiasts do that.

Dr. Parker, Mr. Spurgeon, Dr. Talmage, and Mr. Booth are all little god a'mighties to their respective

followers. Sydney Smith once satirically remarked: "I wish I could be as cock-sure of anything as Tom Macaulay is of everything." And Christians to-day take the strong declarations of Jesus as being sufficient guarantee of their truth, because they are foolish enough to imagine that his boldness would have been tempered with a little discretion if he had not been certain of their truth. But when Jesus said: "He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned," he laid the foundation-stone of a religion that is degrading to humanity.

It is the first duty of every man to think for himself and examine the credentials of whatever system he is asked to accept. To be threatened or intimidated into the acceptance of a religion is a crime—humiliating alike to all concerned. Every man must do his own thinking and express his own thoughts. The priest is not a better thinker than the layman, and religion is a subject that can be as well understood by the common folk as any other, if intelligibly stated. Why, then, should the layman allow the clergy to think for him? Why should he allow his mind to rust or decay to please the priest? Again. Why should Jesus state the whole truth which persons must not disbelieve, in an obscure corner of the earth, to a number of ignorant and fanatical followers, and leave mankind without a written statement of them, except that which was supplied by persons who never saw, nor heard him, nor even lived until years after he was dust? And it must be understood that Jesus did not ask us to believe self-evident propositions. He did not come with doctrines as unmistakably true as the problems of Euclid. If he had we could not help believing them. But would a logical-minded man like Euclid say: "I have written these books: they contain truths which no man must dare dispute; for I declare that he who denies the truth of even one single proposition should be doomed for ever and ever?" No; there was no need for any such stupid declaration. The truth does not need to be bolstered up in this way. It will stand by itself. It will bear looking at fairly. But error shrinks from the test of examination. With the slippery dexterity of an eel, it wriggles and writhes in agony as the sharp knife of criticism cuts it in pieces.

Christianity, then, is a degrading religion because it fears examination and commands its adherents to believe, on the peril of their immortal souls. Perhaps, however, the most degrading feature of the Christian faith is that by which the believer suffers himself to be made a child of god by allowing an innocent person to die in his place and blot out his sins. It is degrading in the highest degree to a man of moral courage to allow another to suffer in his stead. No man with the smallest self-respect could permit it. And yet we are told that god sent his only-begotten son to die to blot out the iniquities of mankind. It would be a libel on the character of any respectable father to say that he sent his innocent son to gaol to suffer for a guilty one.

James Mill truly said that the moral difficulties of the Christian religion were greater than the intellectual ones. Suppose to-day that some villainous murderer were sentenced to death, and when the day for the execution arrived, some innocent person—like Sidney Carton in Dickens's admirable story of the "Tale of Two Cities"—stepped forward and said: "This man is guilty of murder, and should die; but he has friends who love him and desire him to live; I am innocent, but friendless. If I die none will miss me. It will be a far nobler thing for me to die than for this poor wretch. Besides, I shall be but imitating my lord and savior, Jesus Christ. The death of the innocent will atone for the sins of the guilty."

Do you think that the British public would allow the innocent thus to suffer for the guilty? Of course not. They would revolt at the idea. But suppose the innocent one did die, would that blot out the sins of the guilty? Would the death of the innocent restore the murdered man to his family? But if it were true, I would not accept Jesus on such terms. I should be degrading myself. I would neither allow an innocent man nor an innocent god to die in my place. I am prepared to suffer for my own faults. I want no deputy. I am prepared to be paid back in my own coin; and if my life is vicious, I know I cannot escape the consequences in this life, whether there is another or not, whether there is a god or not. I know that every deed I perform in the world is written indelibly in the book of nature, and, whether I like it or not,

cannot be blotted out. I know that virtue shineth like a star in the world; that vice poisons the stream of life; and I have made up my mind that the love of truth and the practice of virtue will make the best religion for the salvation of mankind.

---

### SILLY MIRACLES.

It is a *sine quâ non* of the Christian faith that every true believer must regard the alleged miracles of Jesus as actual occurrences, which demonstrate the divine character of the Nazarene.

When the disciples wrought miracles no claim to divinity was put forth by them. They were, it was said, merely "allowed to work miracles" by god's help. And had they been able to eclipse altogether the wonderful performances of Jesus, nobody would have dreamt of claiming for them divine attributes. Why? Because they were men, poor men; the people who witnessed their performances knew that they had not been miraculously born; but were acquainted personally with their parents and friends, and knew exactly what manner of men they were.

If the gospels give any indication of the character of Jesus, it is clear from them that he was above and before them all—a pretentious and dogmatic man; and modern Christians, if in nothing else, certainly imitate him in these respects.

If there is one man more than any other in this wide world whom I delight in shunning, it is the bombastic creature who calls himself "Christian"; who possesses none of the higher qualities of Christ; and who has nothing to recommend him to our notice but the pretentiousness of the ignoramus and the dogmatism of the bigot.

Pretentiousness is not the characteristic of a wise man. And yet Christians, and even the most learned among them, have mistaken the self-assertion of Jesus as an evidence of his wisdom. The wisest of men have always been modest. Socrates said that if he were wise it was only because he knew how ignorant he was. Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, Epictetus and Plato were wise men, yet who more modest? And in the nineteenth century, whose wisdom more conspicuous than that of the philosopher, John Stuart Mill;

the scientist, Charles Darwin; the statesman, William Ewart Gladstone? Yet who can say that these men were arrogant or pretentious? Nay, none so charmingly modest, unassuming and free from dogmatism than these. And is it likely that if the almighty maker of Darwins and Gladstones sent his only begotten son on earth, that he would have instructed him to comport himself with such unbecoming arrogance as that displayed in the presence of the woman who had given him birth, and upon other occasions, to the dismay of the ignorant and the disgust of the learned? I cannot degrade myself into the belief that a wise and good god would have so conducted himself.

But what of the miracles of Jesus? Were not many of them extremely silly? What good purpose was served by the miraculous fast for forty days and forty nights? Would not Jesus have done more real good if he had eaten sumptuously during all that time, and when the devil came to him and demanded to be convinced that he was in reality the son of god, he had availed himself of the opportunity and converted the devil? What a splendid chance was here thrown recklessly away! The devil might have been converted into a friend, into a believer in Christianity; but now he will be an enemy for evermore.

And what utility was there in the miracle by which some devils were turned out of two men "coming out of the tombs," which evil spirits ultimately found their way into the bodies of a herd of swine, and played such havoc with their constitutions that they immediately committed suicide, much to the astonishment and pecuniary loss of their owners?

And what was the use of Jesus walking on the sea, during a storm, when he could have stilled the waves before he commenced his watery tour?

And what wisdom or goodness was displayed by Jesus in allowing Lazarus to die, in order that he might have the pleasure of raising him to life again? Did Jesus imagine that people would think him tender and loving because he wept; or divine because he cried with "a loud voice" to wake a dead man from the dreamless sleep of the grave?

Or did Jesus perform a useful miracle when he cursed the fig-tree; or when he came into the house where his disciples were feasting, like a flash of lightning, when all the

doors and windows were closed? I say it is degrading to a man of sense to be asked to believe such nonsense.

I wonder that, when men are seriously asked the question whether they believe in the miracles of Jesus, they do not reply: "Why not ask me to believe in the 'Arabian Nights' stories at once?" Both are alike incredible."

But under the influence of Christianity some of the best men I have ever met have been forced into mental and moral serfdom. They have been afraid to say how much of the Christian creed they have repudiated, lest their religious employers should think that they believed too little to be honest; or the employers have been afraid to say how much of it they disbelieved for fear of losing the custom of some person who puts piety before truth, religion before honesty.

And so Christianity has become "an organised hypocrisy," a game for knaves to play at; and many are they who are taken in by the sophistry of the special pleader, and the gorgeous glitter in the churches, and the long array of fashionables who support the degrading creed. But the creed is decayed and crumbling; its *débris* lie athwart our path, waiting for the sons of Freethought and moral courage to clear it away.

---

#### QUEER MORALITY.

WHEN men talk of the sublime morality taught by Jesus, they either speak recklessly or in utter ignorance of the teachings of the Nazarene carpenter. Most true Jesus did give utterance to some noble sentiments; and some of his teachings were of a very elevating character. But what public teacher could hope to gain the ear of the multitude who did not say something of an inspiring or wise nature? Most reformers appeal to the better feelings and lofty aspirations of their hearers; and it is no wonder that Jesus followed the long succession of religious teachers in this regard. But in very truth, all he taught that was entirely original was of a very harmful character, and his good doctrines had been taught by other teachers long before he was born.

Now, does it not strike the sincere Christian as somewhat singular that Jesus, who had been sent into the world by the infinite author of the universe, and who was himself a part of the god-head, should waste his time on earth in performing miracles which were useless or absurd, or proclaiming doctrines which others had taught more successfully before him, or enjoining men to perform certain actions, the tendency of which was to throw the world back into absolute barbarism ?

Fortunate, indeed, it is for the world that even the followers of Christ have never attempted to act out in its entirety the teachings of their master. What sort of persons would the Christians—our parents and friends—have been had they believed Jesus when he said : “If any man come unto me and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple ?” (Luke xiv., 26). Such persons must have been bereft of all humanity. What loving mother would leave her babe to follow a fanatical preacher ? What kind husband would abandon the wife of his bosom, even for the salvation of his own insignificant soul ? Better far be consigned to eternal torment than get eternal bliss on such hateful terms. Why I have seen a kind-hearted, loving woman cling through twenty years of a miserable life to a drunken villain of a husband—who treated her with great harshness and cruelty, and starved the children she had borne him—rather than leave him to his fate, which meant certain ruin, perhaps the gaol, or even the gallows. I have known men who, for love of wife or children, would have suffered pain unutterable, would have gone readily to a painful death to snatch them from the flames or rescue them from the surging waves ; yet these are to be told that Jesus cannot accept them unless they hate those whom they love better even than life itself.

Surely it cannot be said that Jesus propagated lofty morality when he declared : “Think not that I came to send peace on earth. I came not to send peace, but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law ; and a man's foes shall be of his own household ” (Matthew x., 34—36).



Assuredly a very strange mission this! A devil could not come on a worse errand. And yet Christians call this "tidings of great joy." To whom? Humble Christians like Uriah Heep might like it, and Daniel Quilp might chuckle over it; but most persons would prefer that their family relations were not interfered with in this unwarrantable fashion.

When Jesus said, "Love your enemies," he must have been joking; for, clearly, he never attempted to display any affectionate feeling towards his adversaries; and Christians of the present day appear to relish the joke immensely. But never was he more in earnest than when he said, "Blessed be ye poor." Yet nobody appears to appreciate the degrading influence of this doctrine more than the Christians themselves.

A certain sect of Christians have just issued a little book called, "The Bitter Cry of Outcast London," revealing the state of things that obtains in the poorest parts of the metropolis to-day; and a very good commentary it is on the teachings of Jesus.

It is not, and never was, a blessing to be poor. To be poor in a great town—surrounded by those who live in luxury, and know not what it is to want a meal—is a positive curse. What is the condition of the poor in London? Let the Christian answer. The writer of the pamphlet named says: "Few who will read these pages have any conception of what these pestilential human rookeries are—where tens of thousands are crowded together amidst horrors which call to mind what we have heard of the middle passage of the slave-ship. To get into the houses of the poor you have to penetrate courts reeking with poisonous and malodorous gases, arising from accumulations of sewage and refuse scattered in all directions, and often flowing beneath your feet; courts, many of them, which the sun never penetrates which are never visited by a breath of fresh air, and which rarely know the virtue of a drop of cleansing water. You have to ascend rotten staircases which threaten to give way beneath every step, and which in some places have already broken down, leaving gaps that imperil the limbs and the lives of the unwary. You have to grope your way along dark and filthy passages swarming with vermin.

Then, if you are not driven back by the intolerable stench, you may gain admittance to the dens in which these thousands of beings who belong, as much as you, to the race for whom Christ died, herd together."

He continues: "Every room in these rotten and reeking tenements houses a family—often two. In one cellar a sanitary inspector reports finding a father, mother, three children and four pigs. In another room a missionary found a man ill with small-pox, his wife just recovering from her eighth confinement, and the children running about half naked and covered with dirt. Here are seven people living in one underground kitchen, and a little dead child lying in the same room. Elsewhere is a poor widow, her three children, and a child who has been dead thirteen days. Her husband, who was a cabman, had shortly before committed suicide." This does not look as though poverty were a blessing.

From hard and painful experience I have come to the opinion that nearly all the misery and crime in the world may be traced to poverty as its primary cause. "Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat and what ye shall drink" (Matthew vi., 25) has been acted upon by some persons, and the effect has been that our workhouses and gaols are filled, and the deserving and struggling citizens have to pay the piper.

"Resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on the one cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man shall sue thee at the law and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also" (Matthew vi., 39—40). This is very good morality for ruffians and thieves, but not for honest men; and I will not degrade myself, nor humiliate my fellows, by attempting to put such detestable teachings into practice.

---

#### PUNISHMENT WITH A VENGEANCE.

BESIDES the impracticable and decidedly hurtful doctrines I have already enumerated, there are others belonging to the Christian creed which no man in his senses would ever attempt to put into practice.

The young man who asked Jesus what he should do to be saved, himself illustrated the impracticability of Christ's

teachings. All the commandments, he affirmed, he had kept with rigorous self-control from his youth up. He had refrained from stealing, from murder, from lying, slandering and all uncharitableness; had honored his father and mother with a fidelity becoming a dutiful son. This was insufficient to win the admiration of Jesus and deserve salvation.

"One thing thou lackest," says the Nazarene. "Sell all thou hast and give to the poor and follow me." Crest-fallen and disgusted, the young man appears to have turned from Jesus, probably to find some other religious teacher whose doctrines were more compatible with reason and justice. Surely it cannot be a high recommendation for any religion that believers must render themselves veritable beggars before they can accept it.

This is one of the criteria by which we are to know true Christians—that they are ever ready to "sell all they have and give to the poor;" and, like their master, "have not where to lay their head," in order to demonstrate their sincerity.

And, judged by this standard, what a sham Christianity really is in this country. Are there any Christians at all? Lord Shaftesbury, good man though he undoubtedly is, cannot be numbered among the Christians. "Lay not up for yourselves treasures on earth," is a command which has no weight with him. "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven" (Mark x., 25). "Blessed be ye that hunger now for ye shall be filled" (Luke vi., 21). What do rich Christians who are clothed in fine linen and fare sumptuously every day, care for blessedness such as this?

And neither can we honestly say that those large-hearted clergymen, who are helping on the time when we shall all be intellectually free, are true Christians, for do not they trample under foot the degrading teaching that a follower of Christ must on no account have "fellowship with unbelievers?"

And is it fair, is it honest, that men who repudiate with scorn every unreasonable teaching of Jesus, and who in their daily lives do not emulate his noble characteristics—is it manly, I ask, that such as these should "profess and

call themselves Christians" and be accepted as good sheep in the Christian flock ?

---

### JESUS AS AN EXEMPLAR.

SOMETIMES it is urged that though it is well nigh impossible to put into practice all the doctrines of Jesus, one thing every Christian can and should do—he should take the life of his "Blessed lord and savior as a model," for it was clearly the intention of Jesus, when he took upon himself the form of man, to act as an example to humanity in all subsequent ages.

Take then the life of the Nazarene carpenter, and see in what respects it supplies a perfect model for man to follow.

When Jesus was twelve years of age he strayed away from his parents, who had been to a feast at Jerusalem ; and after they had sought in vain for three days to find their child, they discovered him at last in the Temple, discussing with learned doctors and putting to them questions which they found exceedingly difficult to answer (Luke ii., 42-46).

Weary with travelling and bowed down with sorrow, the parents came upon their missing boy.

Naturally, one would have supposed that the boy would have warmly embraced his loving parents and expressed regret at having given them so much trouble and anxiety. Instead of that however, when his mother, with womanly dignity, properly rebuked him for his apparent heedlessness, as he sat undisturbed by her appearance, continuing to question the doctors, he turned upon her and rudely answered: "How is it that ye sought me? wist ye not that I should be about my father's business?"

But as neither Joseph nor Mary knew anything concerning the divine character of their son, they were only the more bewildered and pained by what appeared the insolence of his answer.

Nor would it be well for children of Christian parents to act in like fashion in these days, unless they wished to be something more than sharply rebuked for their pains. I am well aware that many children in these modern times are not characterised by their good manners, but the cause may be easily traced to the parents' carelessness or negli-

gence. An exemplar of the human race, however, should not manifest in his youth those bad qualities of behavior which we most strongly condemn in our own children.

Again, when Jesus had grown to manhood, and commenced his mission as a preacher, we have a right to expect that he would treat his opponents courteously, no matter how unfair they acted towards him.

But not so. Jesus set an example which Christians unfortunately have since most faithfully followed—viz., that of abusing, in strong terms of insult, those of his opponents whose arguments he was probably unable to answer (Matt. 23-33).

If Jesus were to be taken as an exemplar in every detail of his life, and Christians in all their conduct endeavored as far as possible to imitate him, what extraordinary events we should daily witness!

Jesus fasted forty days and forty nights, and therefore Dr. Tanner should be canonized for the bravery he displayed in his marvellous imitation of his Master, though he as near as possible committed suicide.

Jesus fed five thousand hungry people on five loaves and two fishes, and worthy philanthropists would deserve admiration who attempted to achieve a like result.

Insufficient faith, no doubt, is the chief cause of their inability to perform such tasks, for it was Jesus who said that the possession of faith, infinitesimal in quantity as a grain of mustard-seed, would suffice to remove a mountain. How much of the article would be required to feed five thousand on five loaves and two fishes is a problem which the rules of arithmetic afford no aid in solving.

But suppose men to-day were, in imitation of Jesus, to destroy a herd of fat pigs, would not the proprietors thereof sue them (and this not in imitation of their unworthy predecessors) for heavy compensation? Or suppose some Christian, taking Jesus as his model, went to the Stock Exchange and commenced horsewhipping the members; or suppose he put in an appearance at Tattersall's and rebuked the wealthy betting men who stake all that belongs to them and a good deal that does not, on the chance of a horse winning a race, how would such a person be treated?

And when he had been struck on one cheek he turned

to his assailant the other, he would probably get kicked in a fashion he would not be likely to forget.

Or suppose, like Jesus, some poor Christian was homeless, and friendless, and wandered wearily from street to street, and from door to door, finding no shelter—suppose such an individual were brought before Sir Robert Carden, the kindly-hearted Christian City magistrate and alderman, he would most certainly be sent to gaol for one month as a “rogue and a vagabond,” and get soundly condemned in the bargain for being foolish enough to have no home, and no food, and no friends, in free country like England.

Suppose, again, a man saw a barren fig-tree and began to curse it because it had not borne fruit out of season. If he acted in this extraordinary fashion his friends would probably procure a keeper for him or have him safely lodged in a lunatic asylum.

If, in imitation of Jesus, some ardent enthusiast should mount a couple of borrowed donkeys and ride in triumph through the streets—unless he did so on Blackheath on Bank Holiday—he would be taken either as a madman or a thief. In any case he would not be applauded as a wise and useful citizen.

Take the last scene of all that ends this interesting drama. Jesus is arrested and charged with blasphemy. He who is the very god, who has wrought numerous miracles in the sight of his disciples, this god-man has made so little impression on the minds of his followers that in the hour of danger they desert him and leave him to his fate.

But the end is near, and now indeed we must expect a grand display of heroism on the part of Jesus—a dignified bravery worthy of the imitation of the noblest among men under the most trying circumstances. Instead of this what have we? We have a god (who cannot die) who has come to save the world by the shedding of his innocent blood, afraid at the last hour to go through the terrible ordeal. “Oh, my father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me” (Matt. xxvi., 39). What an awful exhibition of weakness we have here—a weakness which manifested itself even more strikingly in the agonising exclamation: “Eloi, eloi, lama sabachthani?” (My god, my god, why hast thou forsaken me?) (Matt. xxvii., 40). If Jesus were indeed

the very god what an example he has set for frail humanity in the hour of peril!

How different was the death of Giardano Bruno! Not only did he suffer for eight long years in prison, but when at last he was brought to the stake he murmured not, but, like a true man, met his death with a defiant heroism that puts to shame the painful weakness of the Nazarene! And yet Jesus is the exemplar, and Bruno only a poor mistaken heretic, unworthy even of the admiration of his fellow men. For my part I cleave to the heroic Bruno, and desire to emulate his noble qualities, and turn deliberately from Jesus, regarding him not as a model, but as a poor, weak enthusiast, who, in the terrible hour of suffering, felt himself alike forsaken by god and man.

#### FUTURE REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS.

LET us, before concluding, look at the dreadful teaching of Jesus in respect to future rewards and punishments. A man is not to be punished according to his deeds, which would be bad enough in all conscience, seeing that most men suffer for their misdeeds in this world, whether there is another or not. According to Jesus, "belief" will save a man without works, but works without belief will be considered as worse than useless.

What will it avail a man that he has rescued thousands of his fellow creatures from a life of ignorance or misery; that he has fought and spent his life's blood in a revolution to free the slave; that he has been tortured on the rack, or consumed at the stake for teaching science; that he has struggled against fearful odds for social, political or religious reform. If he has not believed in Jesus it were better for him that he had never been born, for he is doomed to suffer agony through all eternity.

What an infamy! A human judge would not act with such mercilessness, and shall it be said that the infinite god of the universe, who will preside at the great trial on the "day of judgment," will act with less kindness and humanity than the creatures of his manufacture?

A man who tells a lie—one little lie—who tells a plain-faced maiden that she is the prettiest girl in the world when he knows she is not—will be punished with the same

from How

from How

same matter

severity as a villain who perhaps has poisoned the minds of hundreds, robbed his own kith and kin, or been instrumental in the slaughtering of thousands of inoffensive black-a' moors.

Is a man who is destitute, and who steals a loaf of bread to feed his starving wife and children, as great a criminal as one who deliberately, to serve his own selfish purpose, cuts a human being's throat? I think not.

Heaven and hell. There are only these two places to go to, and all who are not sent to the former must of necessity be consigned to the latter, unless a few more establishments are opened for the purpose. Think of it, Christian! Was I not right when I said that Christianity was a "Degrading Religion?"

But some say that the doctrine of hell-fire was not taught by Jesus. Who then manufactured it? Priests! Ah, priest-made religions are always humiliating. But why did the church teach this horrible doctrine through centuries of ignorance until Freethinkers pointed out its wickedness? Why have the clergy frightened thousands into a declaration of belief in Christianity by a threat of eternal damnation, if Jesus never taught the terrible doctrine?

And are we now to be told that we are not to be damned, but merely condemned? What for? For disbelief? I cannot help it. God has no right to punish me for being true to myself. If god gave me brains with which to think, why did he not render me incapable of disbelief in that which is so necessary for my salvation? Salvation! did I say? If damned only means condemned, how do we know that being saved means any more than being exempt from damnation? Take away hell-fire, and away go also the harps and heavenly mansions! But I say that it will not do to discharge the devil in this summary fashion without also considering what we shall do with god. However we may rest in peace. Of one thing we may all be sure, and that is, that in time the vast majority of mankind will reject Christ also, and improve upon his "Degrading Religion."