

The Gladstone-Ingersoll Debates in The American Periodical Press

Stephen Peterson

[I am] a listener from across the broad Atlantic to the clash of arms in combat between Colonel Ingersoll and Dr. Field on the most momentous of all subjects.... (W.E. Gladstone¹)

Thus wrote the venerable British statesman to his American readers in May 1888. The clash he had been listening to, and the combat he now joined, was the “Field-Ingersoll Controversy,” a symposium on faith and agnosticism in the *North American Review*. In the previous six months the popular journal of literary and cultural commentary had featured exchanges on the topic between Dr. Henry Field, editor of the evangelical Presbyterian *New York Evangelist*, and Col. Robert Ingersoll, the famous agnostic lecturer, author, and Republican politician. Then between his third and fourth premierships, Gladstone had been reading the debate with keen interest while on holiday in Florence, Italy.² He was two years removed from a thorny dispute in the *Nineteenth Century* with T.H. Huxley over Genesis and geology. In that clash he had largely held his own theologically, but was decidedly outmatched in scientific acumen. Now, Gladstone was primed for a return to religious controversy, this time setting his sights upon Ingersoll, the American titan of agnosticism who was both esteemed and reviled.

Gladstone entered boldly into the fray in the May 1888 edition of the *North American Review*. There he unleashed “Colonel Ingersoll on Christianity: Some Remarks on his Reply to Dr. Field,” a twenty-seven page defense of biblical faith that included a lengthy reprimand of

Ingersoll's irreverent prose.³ Gladstone devoted significant space to what he considered the Colonel's "tumultuous method," rebuking the outspoken infidel for failing to approach the subject matter with "deep reverential calm." Ingersoll's disrespect had violated the laws of social morality, Gladstone insisted, because "the name of Jehovah [is] encircled in the heart of every believer with the profoundest reverence and love."⁴ For the devout statesman, Ingersoll's cheekily worded rejoinders to Dr. Field were no doubt seen as a breach of Bishop Joseph Butler's rules for fair and cautious methodology in debate. By contrast, Gladstone concluded, Ingersoll's intemperate style was to "ride an unbroken horse, and to throw the reins upon his neck."⁵ We will see presently that his insistence that the debate be conducted with reverence was exploited by Ingersoll in his rejoinder and by other critical American reviewers. Like Field, Gladstone defended traditional Christian belief and the literal truth of biblical stories of Jephthah and Jonah, which the Colonel had scornfully dismissed in his exchanges with Field, but he belabored the issue in terms of methodology.

Ingersoll's return volley, innocuously titled "Col. Ingersoll to Mr. Gladstone," began with an obligatory nod of respect to the statesman for "the inestimable services that you have rendered, not only to England, but to mankind."⁶ With sufficient niceties dispensed, the balance of the essay was every bit the iconoclastic screed his readers had come to expect. He turned Gladstone's own weapons against him with biting sarcasm: "If you will read again the twenty-eighth chapter of Deuteronomy," Ingersoll demanded, "you will find how Jehovah, the compassionate, whose name is enshrined in so many hearts, threatened to use his power;"⁷ this in reference to the many curses Jehovah promised to inflict upon the disobedient. And again, regarding the eighteenth chapter of I Kings, where Elijah mocked and then murdered the prophets of Baal, Ingersoll ridiculed Gladstone further and railed against the Old Testament deity:

Do you consider that the proper way to attack the God of another? Did not Elijah know that the name of Baal

was encircled in the heart of every believer with the profoundest reverence and love? Did he violate the laws of social morality and decency?⁸

Ingersoll went on to predict the eventual death of dogma as the human mind advanced with science, which was the "enemy of fear and credulity," providing "education and liberty to the human race," refining "every noble thought" through art, music, and drama, and, above all, teaching "that all our obligations are to sentient beings."⁹ The agnostic concluded by aiming one final insult at Gladstone:

And after all, it may be that to ride an unbroken horse with the reins thrown upon his neck as you charge me with doing gives a greater variety to the senses, a keener delight, and a better prospect of winning the race than to sit solemnly astride of a dead one, in deep reverential calm, with the bridle firmly in your hand."¹⁰

Gladstone was not to be granted a rejoinder, however. The duty of answering Ingersoll was assigned instead to Cardinal Manning. The symposium was sustained for more than a year and attracted several prominent authors. Yet it was the single joust between Gladstone and Ingersoll that had captured most of the attention in the American press.

The Field-Ingersoll dispute had attracted modest reporting in U.S. papers, but the heavyweight matchup between Gladstone and Ingersoll became the catalyst for a surge in editorials and printed excerpts. The joust quickly became known as the "Gladstone-Ingersoll Controversy." The Methodist *Zion's Herald* rated Gladstone's entry into the debate "epochal" because "the greatest of English statesmen and orators" had taken up his pen in the cause of Christian truth, and the *Chicago Tribune* believed the dispute was "invested with fresh interest" because Gladstone "combats the positions of Mr. Ingersoll with the zeal and vigor of youth."¹¹ The *New York Tribune* reported that Ingersoll's riposte to Gladstone was hugely popular and had pushed sales of the June issue of the *North American Review* towards the 100,000 mark, well in excess of its competitors.¹² It was among the journal's most

successful symposiums, a feature introduced by Alan Thorndike Rice who purchased the review in 1876. Circulation of the magazine had increased markedly under Rice, who transformed the dry scholarly journal by placing more emphasis on current events and by publishing prominent authors like Gladstone. It soon came to rival the monthly illustrated magazines.¹³ Editors had adopted a similar business model in Britain. James Knowles of the *Nineteenth Century*, for example, was an editor who stage-managed symposiums and even hung pictures of current disputants in his office. Such controversies could prove highly profitable as witnessed by T.H. Huxley's "Agnosticism" piece that ran through four editions.¹⁴ As his June sales figures reveal, by enlisting Gladstone into the *North American Review* symposium Rice had found an ideal foil for Ingersoll. He was eager to exploit the duel, as were other American publications in its aftermath.

To understand the American reaction to Gladstone's debate with Ingersoll, it is essential to appreciate how Americans perceived the statesman in 1888. His fame in the U.S. was certainly due in large part to his role in public affairs. Few educated Americans were unaware of his major accomplishments as prime minister, and U.S. publications, both religious and secular, wrote about them frequently. Despite having his share of American critics on a range of political issues, by 1888 he enjoyed general acclaim across the nation. Several events over the previous two decades had found special resonance with Americans. Among them, they had celebrated his success in disestablishing the Irish Church in 1869; and during the Bradlaugh imbroglio of 1883 they saw shades of the American constitutional ban on religious tests for office when Gladstone endorsed but failed to pass the Affirmation Bill. He had also endeared himself to readers of the *North American Review* with his 1876 article "Kin Beyond Sea" wherein he extolled the virtues of the U.S. Constitution and prophesied the rise of America to the status of empire.¹⁵ The article was at least partially responsible for the U.S. Constitutional Centennial Commission's decision to invite Gladstone to preside as its sole foreign dignitary at the Philadelphia com-

memoration, a request he reluctantly declined.¹⁶ Perhaps no other policy contributed more to the statesman's fame in America than his attempt to establish Irish home rule in 1886, an event that was widely reported in the press. In July 1887 a delegation of distinguished Americans headed by newspaper publisher Joseph Pulitzer and U.S. Representative Perry Belmont traveled to London and presented Gladstone with an elaborate three-foot high silver testimonial trophy for his service in the cause of civil and religious liberty. The commemoration made special mention of his singular attempt to establish Irish home rule.¹⁷ By 1888 Americans generally admired Gladstone as a Christian statesman who shared many of their values.

If Americans had come to know and appreciate Gladstone's statesmanship, they were only somewhat less familiar with his body of Homeric scholarship and his religious essays. His Homeric works were reviewed frequently by American religious and literary periodicals, and the testimonial trophy of 1887 included on one side a bas-relief of Homer's head, showing a degree of appreciation of Gladstone's classical interests.¹⁸ Yet to what extent had Americans been exposed to his previous forays into religious controversy? Gladstone's 1874 and '75 articles addressing the perceived threats of ultramontaniam and papal tyranny¹⁹ received widespread coverage in both secular and religious publications. The polemical tracts were celebrated by most American Protestants and vilified by Roman Catholics. Conversely, his 1885 and '86 debate in the *Nineteenth Century* with T.H. Huxley on "Genesis and Geology"²⁰ garnered less extensive reporting and arrived in the U.S. to mixed reviews. Gladstone entered the Field-Ingersoll dispute, therefore, as a celebrated statesman, yet at the same time he had divided Americans about his effectiveness as a Christian apologist.

The published opinions that appeared in the days and weeks following his *North American Review* exchange with Ingersoll will be the focal point of concern here. Notwithstanding the relative silence of the major New York daily papers, the Gladstone-Ingersoll dispute received significant copy in the American press. The opinions expressed will be

supremely useful for further evaluation of how he was perceived as a Christian apologist in America. Given his celebrity, U.S. views of what Gladstone's presence meant to the symposium will be an important initial consideration. Our primary task will be to categorize the responses of the American press regarding the outcome of the debate. Additionally, in an age of increasing emphasis on specialization, such a study may lend valuable insight into the extent to which Americans believed that a lay theologian, even one as skilled as Gladstone, could effectively combat the agnostic challenge. Additionally, a review of American periodicals has the added benefit of shining a light upon the use of controversy by nineteenth-century writers and copy editors. Their liberal use of martial language, as we will see presently, is noteworthy. The often-used metaphor of warfare between modern scientific thinking and revealed religion was incorporated by all sides of press coverage in the Gladstone-Ingersoll controversy. Indeed it was used by the participants themselves. Gladstone, as the above quote reveals, was listening to the "clash of arms." Such a study will also provide insight into the broad spectrum of American attitudes surrounding the nineteenth-century battle for belief – Gladstone's "most momentous of all subjects."²¹

I.

Before addressing the American response in detail it will be useful to summarize Gladstone's apologetics, along with the general state of secularism and disbelief in late nineteenth-century America. Some background on Ingersoll's status as chief spokesman for American agnosticism will also aid our understanding of the controversy. Defense of orthodox Christianity was Gladstone's chief intellectual preoccupation from the 1870s onward. An American reviewer of "Colonel Ingersoll on Christianity: Some Remarks on his Reply to Dr. Field" (hereafter simply "Remarks"), noted fittingly that "Mr. Gladstone is by taste even more a theologian than a politician."²² David Bebbington has provided a detailed examination of Gladstone's apologetics²³ so a lengthy discussion need not delay us here. Considered briefly, as early as 1840 the statesman had

scented danger and had inveighed against the growing threat of infidelity.²⁴ By 1874 he was convinced that the battle for the welfare of mankind would not be fought in the world of politics but of thought, where, he told his wife, "a deadly attack is made with great tenacity of purpose and over a wide field upon the greatest treasure of mankind, the belief in God, and the gospel of Christ."²⁵ The chief assailant was disbelief, in the form of agnosticism, that was fed by scientism (or scientific naturalism), the over-reaching use, he believed, of scientific tools.

In his role as apologist, Gladstone's defense of faith lay in the authority of the Bible and on the testimony of the church throughout history. His great inspiration, a man he ranked among his "four doctors," was Bishop Joseph Butler. Especially in his classic work, *Analogy of Religion* (1736), Butler's probabilistic apologetics and inductive logic had set the standard for reasonable defense of orthodoxy against deism in the eighteenth century. Gladstone was convinced that Butler could be useful in the late nineteenth-century battle for faith.²⁶ "I am a Butlerian," he wrote to Samuel Laing in 1888, "by which I mean, not so much a champion of any particular argument, as the follower of Butlerian method."²⁷ The Bishop's method in argumentation was of vital importance to Gladstone. Butler cautioned against exaggeration and required one to make concessions when necessary, a style in marked contrast to that of many current religious and agnostic controversialists. As an apologist, Gladstone was not merely a student of theology, however. On many important scientific developments affecting Christian belief, including Darwinism, Gladstone was a devoted student. He had, in fact, read no fewer than fifty-three titles related to human evolution between 1869 and 1877.²⁸ Science was not to be seen as an intrinsic enemy of belief. "There is no colorable ground," he wrote in the "Remarks," "for assuming evolution and revelation to be at variance with one another."²⁹ Gladstone did not retreat into fundamentalism or anti-intellectualism in his defense of faith. He was convinced of the essential unity of all truth. Gladstone hoped to launch a counter-revolution against the growing crisis of agnosticism.³⁰

If there was a Victorian crisis of faith in the latter half of the century, it was not because thinking people were abandoning Christianity in droves. As Timothy Larsen's work informs us, any master narrative about the triumph of doubt over faith must be balanced against testimonies of conversions and reconversions to faith by a number of prominent secularists.³¹ Moreover, evangelicalism continued as a relatively robust force on both sides of the Atlantic during the period. Nevertheless, infidelity and secularism were increasingly influencing culture in the latter decades of the century, a period of perceived crisis for men like Gladstone, who feared the threat of disbelief to Christian civilization.³² For the first time in Anglo-American culture, men like Ingersoll, Huxley, and the atheist Charles Bradlaugh were able to promote their views openly and with relative impunity. Their liberty was relative, because in America, for example, there continued to be censorship of free-thought publications and imprisonments, like that of D.M. Bennett in 1879, under the Comstock laws; and in Britain atheists Charles Bradlaugh and Annie Besant were tried for blasphemy in 1877 for distributing birth control literature.³³ Furthermore, for six years Bradlaugh was prevented from taking his seat as an elected Member of Parliament largely because of his professed atheism.³⁴ The rise of scientific naturalism along with the emergence of anthropology and comparative religion as serious fields of study led many, though certainly not most, educated people to conclude that revealed religions were merely relics that had survived primeval humanity.³⁵ In Great Britain the shifting contours of the intellectual landscape came into public view through the works of high-profile agnostics such as T.H. Huxley, Herbert Spencer, and George Eliot (Mary Anne Evans), and through free-thought publications like Charles Bradlaugh's *National Reformer*. American freethinkers were inspired by their writings and lecture tours. For example, those made by Huxley to the U.S. in 1876 and by Charles Bradlaugh from 1873 to 1875 were notable for the interest they inspired.³⁶ American infidelity had fewer original thinkers, but included renowned figures such as Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr, Elizabeth Cady

Stanton, Charles Eliot Norton, Henry Adams, and its most outspoken proponent, Robert Ingersoll.

Agnosticism in America was part of a larger Anglo-American free-thought movement that flourished in the latter half of the nineteenth century. It was by no means a unified movement, but most freethinkers held a common rejection of revealed religion and a general disregard for clerical authority. They ranged from unorthodox Christians to agnostics to outspoken atheists. In the U.S. they were as active in the Midwest as they were on the east coast.³⁷ To be sure, noteworthy free-thought activities existed in the first half of the nineteenth century, but the post-Darwinian period of 1875 to 1914 was the high-water mark for its influence in America. The period witnessed a torrent of new free-thought publications like the *Boston Investigator* and D.M. Bennett's *The Truth Seeker*. Free-thought organizations such as the National Liberal League and the Rationalist Association of North America were also on the rise. The 1875 dedication of the Thomas Paine Memorial Hall in Boston stands as a powerful symbol of the movement's rise to a measure of respectability,³⁸ as does the 1876 founding of Johns Hopkins University where T.H. Huxley was a featured speaker for its inaugural exercises.³⁹ Politically, American freethinkers in the post-war period were often wedded to socialism, but there were capitalists in their ranks as well, such as the corporate trial lawyer Robert Ingersoll. They were generally united around the issues of free speech, women's rights, opposition to capital punishment, as well as prison and asylum reform, but their *cause célèbre* was public education. Freethinkers characterized religious authorities as pernicious gatekeepers to education and therefore insisted that it be secular and publicly financed. The movement encompassed a broad range of disciplines and was strengthened in America by the expansion of public schools and libraries in the post-war decades.⁴⁰

Admittedly doubt was not invented by the Victorians, but in its eighteenth-century version skeptics had cast off the supernatural elements of Christian orthodoxy while continuing to embrace natural the-

ology. They remained comfortably within the orbit of Christian metaphysics. As D.H. Meyer suggested, “they still needed God to explain the universe and account for the natural order.”⁴¹ However, the growth of Victorian skepticism resulted from more than the tensions between religion and the sciences. Like their evangelical counterparts, free-thinkers of the period were intensely moralistic. Many agnostics, including Ingersoll, rejected the Bible’s veracity on ethical grounds quite similar to those of the deists in the previous century. That is, much that the Bible taught was itself considered immoral. The traditional doctrines of hell, the substitutionary atonement, and the wrathful God of the Old Testament were subjected to particular derision. Victorian agnostics had abandoned faith, but they often clung tightly to morality. An 1865 journal entry by Leslie Stephen captures the sentiment: “I now believe in nothing, to put it shortly; but I do not the less believe in morality.”⁴² Ingersoll’s lectures and writings were laced with diatribes against the immorality of Jehovah and his followers. In his *North American Review* rejoinder to Gladstone he accused the Old Testament God of no less than endorsing murder, cruelty to animals, bloodlust, slavery, genocide, polygamy, and the subjugation of women.⁴³ “That what you call unbelief,” Ingersoll insisted, “is only a higher and holier faith.”⁴⁴ As James Turner has observed, for Victorian agnostics “moralism was the peak that still stood, prominent in its isolation, after other beliefs had eroded.”⁴⁵ Robert Ingersoll embodied this worldview and was its most forceful American proponent.

Ingersoll’s rejection of Christianity, he claimed, resulted from his rigorous Calvinist childhood. His father John was an evangelical clergyman steeped in Presbyterian orthodoxy. The catalyst for Robert’s agnosticism was the doctrine of eternal punishment. At the age of seven he heard an itinerant evangelist present a graphic description of the tortures of hell and from that moment he told himself, “It is a lie, and I hate your religion.”⁴⁶ The father’s tireless efforts to correct the erring son went unrewarded, and despite the youthful Robert’s cover to cover knowledge of the Bible, in later years he claimed he could not recall a

time when he had accepted orthodox religion.⁴⁷ Ingersoll rose to the rank of colonel in the Union Army during the Civil War and later became active in Illinois Republican politics and achieved success as a corporate trial lawyer. He achieved national prominence at the 1876 Republican National Convention where he placed the name of James G. Blaine in nomination for the presidency.⁴⁸ By all accounts Ingersoll was a spell-binding orator. His lectures often attracted thousands and ranged over issues well beyond agnosticism including politics, civil liberties, science, marriage and parenting, education, and the arts. Known as "The Great Agnostic" to his supporters and "Robert Injuresoul" to his critics, Ingersoll was clearly the secular spokesman for an age of change. He also possessed a spotless reputation and was accounted a dedicated family man even by his critics.⁴⁹ A prolific author, his collected works fill twelve volumes, and at the height of his career in the 1880s and '90s he spoke in hundreds of towns each year. The popularity of his lectures and his prodigious itinerancy make it likely that few nineteenth-century Americans spoke publicly to more people than Ingersoll. Just prior to the release of the June 1888 number of the *North American Review*, the *New York Sun* ran a story about Ingersoll's fame suggesting that the enormous advanced demand for the publication was due largely to anticipation of reading Ingersoll's lively prose in reply to Gladstone.⁵⁰ Thus the pairing of America's greatest infidel with Britain's foremost Christian statesman made for great copy in the American press.

II.

Among American reviewers of Gladstone's "Remarks" there was a general consensus that his fame had transformed the *North American Review*'s symposium. His fellow participants were certainly impressed. "Little did we imagine", wrote Dr. Field, "when writing the "Open Letter to Robert G. Ingersoll" that the progress of the controversy would draw into it the greatest living Englishman."⁵¹ In his rejoinder, Ingersoll too expressed high regard for Gladstone's intellect and character,

paying tribute to his “exalted position in the estimation of the civilized world.” And he added, “I gladly acknowledge the inestimable services that you have rendered, not only to England, but to mankind.”⁵² A Chicago clergyman believed that the Ingersoll-Field discussion was the most important recent event in the religious world, but that it was “still more notable that the Grand Old Man has been drawn into the great debate.”⁵³ And in the opinion of the *Raleigh News and Observer*, “Mr. Gladstone was recognized as the greatest of English controversialists before Mr. Ingersoll reached adulthood.”⁵⁴

One measurable result of Gladstone’s presence was increased sales for the *North American Review*. As of 17 May the *New York Evangelist* had reported that the numbers of the *Review* containing the Field-Ingersoll discussion had passed through ten and twelve editions, something, it said, “nearly unexampled in the circulation of such dignified and costly reviews.”⁵⁵ By the end of May, however, the single number containing Gladstone’s article had already swollen to its fifty-seventh edition, roughly 30,000 copies by the estimate of the *Evangelist*.⁵⁶ The *Review* continued to pour out edition after edition of the symposium until there were no less than fifty or sixty thousand extra copies sold.⁵⁷ Moreover, there is evidence that the Gladstone-Ingersoll debate continued to influence American religion nearly two months after Gladstone’s article appeared. The *Milwaukee Daily Journal* reported that George H. Ide would speak on “Gladstone vs. Ingersoll” at Grand Avenue Congregational Church.⁵⁸ Gladstone had brought the weight of his celebrity and had piqued interest in the forum. And his American admirers supplied him the flattering epithets: the *Methodist Review* called him a “giant” who held Ingersoll pygmy-like in his hands.⁵⁹ The *Philadelphia Inquirer* also cast him as a “giant among men,” and it dubbed him with that most Victorian of traits, manliness: “Mr. Gladstone appears in the discussion frankly and nobly, every inch a man.” And, perhaps most flattering of all, he was “a modern St. Paul in his union of perspicuity and logic.”⁶⁰ Gladstone’s celebrity was clearly an important factor in transforming the symposium.

Although there was common agreement that Gladstone had heightened public interest through the sheer force of his presence, not everyone agreed that the outcome had served the cause of truth. Writing in *Zion's Herald*, Charles Littlefield believed Ingersoll was out-argued by Gladstone, but asked whether it was sensible to honor the agnostic with a response: "Is it wise? Has Mr. Gladstone done much more than to dignify and give publicity to Ingersoll's brilliant sentences and plausible and captivating statements?"⁶¹ Littlefield believed Gladstone helped only to sell magazines and bring Ingersoll's views to prominence: "If a dividend was to be declared in this debate, would not the profits be divided in about this order – infidelity first, *North American Review* second, and Christianity third?"⁶² The *Methodist Review* expressed similar concern: "one cannot help regretting that the incorrigible skeptic may gain some prestige among the thoughtless because the English statesman accepts him as a foreman worthy of his steel."⁶³ Another religious publication, the influential *Independent*, had similar misgivings. It failed to see what advantage could come out of giving voice to Ingersoll, other than to the publisher. Thus, at least some Christians who shared Gladstone's distaste for disbelief viewed his entry into the dispute as a double-edged sword.

If American Christians were convinced that Gladstone had stamped the debate with his own celebrity, to what extent did they believe he had vanquished his agnostic foe? An unqualified and resounding yes came primarily from evangelicals. There was predictable praise in Henry Field's *New York Evangelist*. In commending the article to his readers, Field himself was exuberant, calling it "a specimen of masterly reasoning," and noting that "Few things which Mr. Gladstone has written have impressed us more with his versatility and power." The article, he said, had "far exceeded expectations" considering that Gladstone was deeply absorbed in public affairs and was still able to "discuss questions quite outside of the sphere of a statesman."⁶⁴ *Zion's Herald* called Gladstone's "Remarks" "magnificent" because he had punctured the sophistries of Ingersoll with his pen and demonstrated that the at-

tacks of the agnostic had not penetrated the citadel of Christian truth.⁶⁵ The correspondent believed that the statesman had effectively answered Ingersoll's claims that evolution and revelation were at variance and that Buddha was comparable to Christ. Unlike strict biblical literalists, he believed evolution presented little problem for a theistic worldview if one could discern true religion and sound science.⁶⁶ Lyman Abbott's inter-denominational and liberal-leaning *Christian Union* lauded Gladstone's assault on Ingersoll. Among other things, he had mercilessly exposed his "misquotations of Scripture ... his philosophical inconsistencies ... [and] the essential immorality of Mr. Ingersoll's method."⁶⁷ Gladstone had spilled much ink to correct Ingersoll's assertion that the Bible had condoned child sacrifice through the stories of Abraham and Jephthah. The *Christian Union* was convinced that Gladstone had successfully defended the faith, which among advocates of progressive orthodoxy appears as an exception. The important denominational organ, the *Methodist Review*, also had high praise for the "Remarks." It was a "brilliant article by the Hon. W.E. Gladstone, in which he literally tears to pieces the tissue of fallacies which made up Colonel Ingersoll's 'Reply to Dr. Field.'"⁶⁸ The evangelical press had embraced Gladstone's defense of faith with few reservations.

Enthusiastic support for Gladstone was evident in at least a couple of mainstream newspapers. Writing for the *Morning Oregonian* under his "Nym Crinkle" pseudonym, the well-known critic and playwright Andrew C. Wheeler penned an anti-Ingersoll diatribe entitled "Puncturing the Pagan." "One reads now," Wheeler intoned, "with calm admiration what that splendid master of critical exegesis, Mr. Gladstone, says." Wheeler only regretted that the "captain's spear" had not been aimed at some leader of the conflict rather than at a "noisy camp follower" like Ingersoll.⁶⁹ The *Raleigh News and Observer* offered some of the most colorful, if overblown, analysis. Gladstone had delivered "sledge hammer blows" to Ingersoll and had made "one of the most noteworthy of contributions to the vindication of the Christian religion."⁷⁰ Gladstone had rightly condemned Ingersoll's mocking tone:

"The aged champion deals with the rampageous Bob from the serene heights of faith, [and] impales the flippant infidel on the point of the spear of truth and holds him up to the scorn of all properly disciplined minds."⁷¹ Partisan supporters of Gladstone and orthodox Christian belief could be found in the mainstream newspapers as well. The statesman's role in the controversy had provided traditional Christians with a rallying point against the growing threat of infidelity. However, there was noticeable silence from the Roman Catholic publications, *The American Catholic Quarterly* and the *Catholic World*, both of which had regularly taken issue with modern critics of the Church. As it turns out, both had been critical of Gladstone's handling of the Bradlaugh affair; and bitter memories of his Vatican Decrees pamphlets may also have restrained Catholic support for his "Remarks."

Like Gladstone, Ingersoll was enthusiastically supported by his base. Ingersoll was a hero at the nationally-circulated, free-thought *Boston Investigator*, which was highly energized by the controversy. No paper covered the debate as devotedly as the *Investigator*. Like its evangelical counterparts, the commentary took on an air of propaganda, and they used the popular dispute to extol their champion. Editorials and letters to the editor about the controversy abounded for days, nearly all of which were critical of Gladstone's "Remarks" and effusive in praise for Ingersoll. There were also free-thought lectures held on the controversy. Of note was a 20 May 1888 address delivered in Boston by popular Ingersoll acolyte W.M. Chandler – dubbed "the Young Ingersoll" – for the express purpose of answering Gladstone.⁷² The event took place before the Ingersoll Secular Society and was staged conspicuously in Investigator Hall at the Paine Memorial. The *Boston Investigator* printed the text in full.⁷³ Chandler cast his hero Ingersoll as the "Hercules of Free Thought" for dispatching Dr. Field and now Gladstone, who, Chandler insisted, was enlisted solely for his greatness as a man, not for his greatness as a theologian – a back-handed yet noteworthy compliment. Chandler's lecture was one of the most detailed, if partisan, critiques of the "Remarks" from any quarter. He

roundly attacked Gladstone's defense of Jephthah for the sacrifice of his daughter to Jehovah. Taunting the statesman with his own words, Chandler urged his listeners to "look upon that sickening picture, and then try to compose your mind in a state of 'deep reverential calm.'"⁷⁴ Like Ingersoll, Chandler found Gladstone's reconciliation of Darwin and Genesis thoroughly unconvincing. He concluded his remarks with an apt military metaphor based on the American Revolution, boasting that England's "most illustrious statesman must hand his lance to America's most illustrious orator and debater, as did Cornwallis his sword to Washington at Yorktown."⁷⁵

In November 1888 the influential freethinker and editor of the *Boston Investigator*, Lemuel K. Washburn, also addressed the Ingersoll Secular Society.⁷⁶ More a response to Cardinal Manning's recent contribution to the *North American Review* symposium, his lecture also touched on Gladstone's "Remarks." Washburn alleged that "the entire 'thinking world' had given the victory to Ingersoll." It had been cruel to raise the hopes of the faithful with promises that the great Englishman would snap infidelity asunder in his mighty hands. With derision, Washburn declared: "Mr. Gladstone was read, pitied, and forgotten. A 'deep, reverential calm' followed. But it was the calm before the storm."⁷⁷ Intoxicated with Victorian confidence in secularism and progress, Washburn pronounced that orthodoxy had left the field to unbelief. Later, in a reply to an *Investigator* letter to the editor, Washburn conjured up his own trans-Atlantic military metaphor. The Gladstone-Ingersoll debate had reminded him of what Commodore Perry said when he conquered the British fleet on Lake Erie: "We have met the enemy, and they are ours. Colonel Ingersoll could say with equal confidence that 'I have met the 'grand old man' in the *North American Review* and he is mine."⁷⁸ Freethinkers had predictably given the match to Ingersoll. For them, Gladstone's apologetics had failed to penetrate the citadel of unbelief, and they believed that the great agnostic's defeat of the formidable Christian champion had strengthened their cause.

We have seen that support for Gladstone could be found outside the religious press in mainstream newspapers, but the opposite was also

true. The *New York Times* believed he had wrongly attempted to establish mutual points of consent by addressing Ingersoll directly. The preferred method was that of Cardinal Manning, who in his rebuttal refused even to acknowledge Ingersoll.⁷⁹ The *Milwaukee Daily Journal* was even more critical and reflected the prevailing sentiment of late Victorian secularism. "The world is rapidly outgrowing old traditions and rejecting the supernatural," it stated.⁸⁰ Humanity was progressing to a place where men could be devout without adherence to the dogmas of the past, but Gladstone had attached too much importance to the reverential. Additionally, the *Journal* insisted, "nothing not true is entitled to the respect of reverence."⁸¹ The article went on to detail Christianity's historical opposition to science, Darwin being the most recent case in point.⁸² Gladstone was apparently guilty by association despite his insistence in the "Remarks" that "there is no colorable ground for assuming evolution and revelation to be at variance with one another."⁸³ The *Journal* concluded that Gladstone's comments were "not intellectually as satisfactory a production as might have been expected from so eminent a personage."⁸⁴ In Kansas, the *Atchison Daily Globe* gave only these brief words in response to the forum: "The general impression is that good old Mr. Gladstone was badly used up in his controversy with Bob Ingersoll."⁸⁵ The *Chicago Daily Inter Ocean* concluded that Gladstone's article was "disappointing" because his main object was to protest against Ingersoll's method rather than his ideas. The reviewer referenced a recent sporting event for the metaphorical language of battle between Great Britain and America. Here it was the boxing ring, a reference to the recent thirty-round heavyweight bout between American John L. Sullivan and Englishman Charlie Mitchell in which they had fought to a draw. "Sullivan and Mitchell," it was quipped, "rather than Achilles and Hector, would seem to be the Gladstonian patterns for theological debate."⁸⁶ At least a few mainstream newspapers were reporting that Gladstone had failed to achieve victory over Ingersoll.

The *Christian Union* notwithstanding, Christians who embraced a liberal theology were more critical of Gladstone than their conservative

co-religionists, yet they were by no means supporters of Ingersoll and they generally sympathized with Gladstone. Having embraced the New Theology, liberals of the period had departed from strict orthodoxy in varying degrees. Under the title “Aggressive Infidelity Using its Advantage” the one-time conservative Calvinist, but by 1888 liberal, *Andover Review* used the controversy to highlight how dogmatic theology had misrepresented Christianity and given unbelief like that espoused by Ingersoll its principal advantage. Gladstone was commended for recognizing that Ingersoll’s reply to Field had addressed a very limited section of Christianity, that of Calvinist orthodoxy. Indeed the statesman had declined to be held bound by Christian tenets that came from “some hole and corner of its vast organization; and not the heavenly treasure,” a reference to strict Calvinism, which he could not “undertake to defend all along the line.”⁸⁷ The *Andover Review* largely sympathized with Gladstone, but it also suggested that his “Remarks” had failed to persuade the less educated: “Mr. Gladstone addresses the bench; the bench sees that the jury is wrong, but the jury does not see that the bench is right. Meantime, what shall be done about the jury?”⁸⁸ Gladstone’s article, therefore, was an effective advocacy for educated and discriminating minds, but it was not the apologetic approach required to combat the aggressive and popular infidelity of Ingersoll.⁸⁹

The prominent Unitarian and former Harvard professor Frederic H. Hedge wrote an article that touched upon the controversy for the Unitarian organ, the *Unitarian Review*. Entitled “Atheism,” Hedge’s article was concerned primarily with the inadequacy of naturalistic proofs in the fight against unbelief, but in the final two paragraphs he offered his perspective on the debate between Gladstone and Ingersoll. The less than edifying spectacle featured disbelief in its crudest form as represented by Ingersoll, while at the same time Christianity had been poorly represented by the venerable statesman:

Mr. Gladstone, the most commanding figure at present in English politics, and a great scholar in secular learning, is no theologian, and, with his obsolete idea of the

literal inspiration and historic truth of the Old Testament, is no match for Col. Ingersoll: he offers an easy mark for the assaults of his formidable antagonist.⁹⁰

Hedge wondered aloud why Allen Thorndike Rice, editor of the *North American Review*, did not bring some approved theologian into the arena. The unspoken answer, of course, was magazine sales. Regardless of his prominent reputation, for Hedge, Gladstone's defense of belief had not succeeded.

Rice was determined to keep the popular symposium alive and in July 1888 he enlisted five prominent authors from various fields of knowledge to contribute to the *North American Review* symposium under the title, "The Combat for the Faith: The Field-Ingersoll-Gladstone Controversy." As it turned out, none of the five endorsed Gladstone's method, let alone declared him a winner in the debate. Novelist and social reformer Elizabeth Stuart Phelps had few direct comments on Gladstone, but acknowledged he was a "distinguished statesman whose scholarship, dignity, and repose have given value to the conflict if they have not won the day."⁹¹ Nevertheless, neither Field nor Gladstone had succeeded, in her opinion, because there was no premise to the debate and thus all participants were firing at random. Phelps suggested as a starting point for debate the anachronism of creeds. She contended that ecclesiastical creeds were outdated, "a fact as simple and inevitable as changes in orthography, etymology, philosophy, science. All other forms of truth are subject to the law of variation in progress. Religious belief is no exception."⁹² Phelps' other criticism reflected the trend toward specialization in the period: "Where are the specialists of the occasion? Where are the experts in exegesis? In theology? In the most practical and renowned successes of the ministry of the living faith?"⁹³ None of the three major participants possessed sufficient qualifications, she insisted. Lay theologians like Gladstone had lost credibility among the new intelligentsia.

Of the remaining participants in the forum, the only direct commentary on Gladstone came from Frederick R. Courdert, the eminent New

York jurist. He sympathized with Gladstone but judged the "Remarks" a failure. For Courdert, a devout Roman Catholic, it was scarcely possible that Field and Gladstone could have "written so many pages without some good result."⁹⁴ In a lengthy critique of Gladstone's "Remarks," he expressed the highest regard for the statesman as a scholar and acknowledged his previous record as a skilled debater, but believed his defeat in the contest with Colonel Ingersoll was a foregone conclusion. Gladstone's affinity for Butlerian methodology was again at issue. He had "entered the arena shorn of his best advantages and exposed to receive blows which the very nature of the controversy forbade him to return with effect."⁹⁵ Courdert attributed this to the fact that the combatants were not bound by the same rules or weapons. Gladstone was handicapped by his reverence and earnestness for the cause of revealed religion, whereas Ingersoll was free to descend into irreverence and sophistry. Courdert reprimanded Gladstone because "he complains in tones of aggrieved surprise that Col. Ingersoll does not conform to *his* rules of controversial discussion."⁹⁶ This was yet another reference to Gladstone's reproof of Ingersoll for his lack of reverence. Courdert took Gladstone to task for his strenuous objections to Ingersoll's tone: "Is it disrespectful to ask why that eminent champion of the Christian religion entered upon a contest wherein he must have known that the same objectionable features would be repeated and probably reproduced in an aggravated form."⁹⁷

According to Courdert, the fatal flaw in Gladstone's article was his concession, however much qualified, to justify his conclusions according to reason and common sense – a direct assault on his Butlerian method. The statesman had thrown aside his armor and blunted his sword when he had proposed in the "Remarks" to "decide for ourselves, by the use of the faculty of reason given us, the great questions of natural and revealed religion."⁹⁸ Courdert noted Ingersoll's expressed pleasure in Gladstone's disclaimer. In his rejoinder Ingersoll had declared, "this is certainly a morning star. Let me take this statement, let me hold it as a torch, and by its light I beg you to read the bible once again."⁹⁹ Interpreting Ingersoll, Courdert stated that "he no

doubt means that Mr. Gladstone has abandoned his case and surrendered at his adversary's discretion."¹⁰⁰ He surmised that by engaging Ingersoll on his terms, Gladstone had been misled into fruitless arguments about the literal truth of stories about Jephthah and Jonah. He would have better served his cause, said Courdert, by expounding on "what Christianity has done and is doing for the human race." The system of Christian belief was interwoven with all the progress of the last eighteen hundred years and, regrettably, "none more wisely and eloquently than Mr. Gladstone could have warned society of the dangers and evils which a reckless eagerness for untried systems and an impatient sufferance of whatever *is*, may produce."¹⁰¹ This, however, had not been the result of the "Remarks." Instead Gladstone had left Ingersoll "the master of an undisputed field."¹⁰² Courdert concluded by expressing remorse that for the first time in history "men's tongues and pens are free to malign religion" and he warned that this may change the whole structure of society.¹⁰³ For Courdert, the method of the "Remarks" was not what was needed in the battle against the daunting challenges posed by newly liberated infidelity.

III.

In the final analysis, Gladstone's participation in the debate was noteworthy for several reasons. By entering the American conflict between faith and unbelief he had stimulated greater interest in the debate and his name became part-and-parcel of the *North American Review* symposium. He had provoked a wide range of opinion concerning his effectiveness as an apologist and also how modern Christians could best confront the challenge of agnosticism. Moreover, there were opportunities for all interested parties to take advantage of his presence in the forum: Allen Thorndike Rice sold many more magazines; champions of orthodoxy and infidelity found a high-profile celebrity whom they could laud or loathe in order to rally their troops to battle; and liberal-minded Christians were given a larger forum to challenge both conservative orthodoxy and radical skepticism.

There was perhaps much more at stake for Gladstone than the \$1,200 he reportedly received for the essay.¹⁰⁴ His reputation as author and apologist was at risk, and he was not one who sought easy praise by preaching to the choir. For Gladstone, after all, this was a battle for the very welfare of mankind. He was convinced that he could beat back agnosticism, armed in part with the methods of Bishop Butler. Free-thinkers were predictably unanimous in their conviction that Gladstone had suffered humiliating defeat at the hands of Ingersoll. Liberal Christians were perhaps the group he most needed to win over, but having already imbibed deep draughts of the New Theology they judged his attack on infidelity to have fallen short of the mark. Furthermore, there was at least some sentiment that he lacked the specialized knowledge needed for the debate. Even though some support for Gladstone could be found in mainstream newspapers, conservative evangelicals stood nearly alone, at least as far as published opinion would suggest, in their belief that Gladstone had bested Ingersoll. (American Evangelical support had also been high in his previous public controversies surrounding Vaticanism and Huxley.) Some of their spiritual progeny would fight the battle of the next generation, the American fundamentalist-modernist controversy. Thus, in the end Gladstone had represented traditional Christianity well for those conservatives of like mind, which doubtless represented a majority of church-going Americans in 1888. However, in the context of elite education and culture his apologetics were considered passé both in style and substance. In his assault on Ingersoll, Gladstone the religious controversialist had not achieved the same universal acclaim as Gladstone the statesman.

Independent Scholar

Notes

¹ W.E. Gladstone, "Colonel Ingersoll on Christianity: Some Remarks on His Reply to Dr. Field," *North American Review*, 146:378 (1888), 481.

² David Bebbington, *The Mind of Gladstone: Religion, Homer and Politics* (Oxford UP, 2004), 245.

³ William E. Gladstone, "Colonel Ingersoll on Christianity: Some Remarks on His Reply to Dr. Field," *North American Review*, 146:378 (1888): 483-85.

⁴ Gladstone, "Colonel Ingersoll on Christianity," 484.

⁵ Gladstone, "Colonel Ingersoll on Christianity," 508.

⁶ Robert G. Ingersoll, "Col. Ingersoll to Mr. Gladstone," *North American Review*, 146:379 (1888), 601.

⁷ Ingersoll, "Col. Ingersoll to Mr. Gladstone," 610.

⁸ Ingersoll, "Col. Ingersoll to Mr. Gladstone," 609.

⁹ Ingersoll, "Col. Ingersoll to Mr. Gladstone," 639, 640.

¹⁰ Ingersoll, "Col. Ingersoll to Mr. Gladstone," 640.

¹¹ "Gladstone and Ingersoll," *Zion's Herald*, 2 May 1888, 140; "Gladstone's Reply to Ingersoll," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, 29 April 1888, 28.

¹² *New York Tribune*, 9 June 1888, 6.

¹³ "Death of Allen Thorndike Rice," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, 17 May 1889, 4.

¹⁴ Adrian Desmond, *Huxley: from Devil's Disciple to Evolution's High Priest* (Reading, MA: Perseus Books, 1994), 571.

¹⁵ William E. Gladstone, "Kin Beyond Sea," *North American Review* 127:264 (1878): 179-212.

¹⁶ "Mr. Gladstone and the American Constitution," *The Times*, 7 September 1887, 10.

¹⁷ "The American Presentation to Mr. Gladstone," *The Times*, 11 July 1887, 11.

¹⁸ "The American Presentation to Mr. Gladstone," *The Times*, 11 July 1887, 11.

¹⁹ William Ewart Gladstone, *Rome and the Newest Fashions in Religion: Three Tracts, the Vatican Decrees, Vaticanism, Speeches of the Pope* (London: John Murray, 1875).

²⁰ For a compilation of all the published essays in the *Nineteenth Century* symposium see William E. Gladstone and others, *The Order of Creation: the Conflict between Genesis and Geology* (New York: The

Truth Seeker Company, 1886). See also Peter Erb, "Rhetorics of Belief: Persuasive Style in the Gladstone, Réville, and Huxley Debates," 87-112 above.

²¹ Gladstone, "Colonel Ingersoll on Christianity," 481.

²² *The Independent*, 3 May 1888, 12.

²³ See "The Battle of Belief" in Bebbington, *Mind of Gladstone*, 216-56.

²⁴ Bebbington, *Mind of Gladstone*, 128.

²⁵ "William E. Gladstone to Catherine Gladstone," 6 April 1874, in A. Tilney Bassett, ed., *Gladstone to His Wife* (London, 1936), 201-2, cited in Bebbington, *Mind of Gladstone*, 217.

²⁶ See Bebbington, *Mind of Gladstone*, 229-33.

²⁷ William E. Gladstone to Samuel Laing, 9 September 1888, in D.C. Lathbury, *Correspondence on Church and Religion of William Ewart Gladstone*, 2 vols (London: John Murray, 1910), 2, 113.

²⁸ Bebbington, *Mind of Gladstone*, 235, 248.

²⁹ Gladstone, "Colonel Ingersoll on Christianity," 491.

³⁰ Bebbington, *Mind of Gladstone*, 255.

³¹ See Timothy Larsen, *Crisis of Doubt: Honest Faith in Nineteenth-Century England* (Oxford UP, 2009).

³² See Edward Royle, ed., *The Infidel Tradition from Paine to Bradlaugh* (London: The Macmillan Press Ltd., 1976); and Royle, *Victorian Infidels* (Manchester UP, 1974).

³³ Roderick Bradford, *D.M. Bennett: The Truth Seeker* (Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 2006), 97-129, 249-52.

³⁴ See Walter Arnstein, *The Bradlaugh Case: Atheism, Sex, and Politics Among the Late Victorians* (U of Missouri P, 1983.)

³⁵ James Turner, *Without God, Without Creed: The Origins of Unbelief in America* (Johns Hopkins UP, 1985), 150-53.

³⁶ For an account of T.H. Huxley's 1876 U.S. tour see "The American Dream," in Adrian Desmond, *Huxley: from Devil's Disciple to Evolution's High Priest* (Reading, MA: Perseus Books, 1994), 463-82; For Bradlaugh's U.S. tours see Adolphe S. Headingley, *The Biography*

of Charles Bradlaugh, 2nd ed. (London: Freethought Publishing Co., 1888), 147-58.

³⁷ See Fred Whitehead and Verle Muhrer, *Free-Thought on the American Frontier* (Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books, 1992).

³⁸ Sydney Warren, *American Freethought, 1860-1914* (New York: Gordian Press, Inc., 1966), 19-44.

³⁹ "Huxley on Universities," *New York Times* 13 Sep 1876, 2; and for importance of Johns Hopkins University as a challenge to Old Protestantism see Mark Noll, *A History of Christianity in the United States and Canada* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1992), 365.

⁴⁰ Susan Jacoby, *Freethinkers: A History of American Secularism* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2004), 151-56.

⁴¹ D.H. Meyer, "American Intellectuals and the American Crisis of Faith," *American Quarterly* 27:5 (1975), 587.

⁴² Leslie Stephen, *Journal*, 26 January 1865, quoted in Frederic William Maitland, *The Life of Leslie Stephen* (London, 1906), 144, cited in Turner, *Without God Without Creed*, 203.

⁴³ Ingersoll, "Col. Ingersoll to Mr. Gladstone," 609-15.

⁴⁴ Ingersoll, "Col. Ingersoll to Mr. Gladstone," 603, 604.

⁴⁵ James Turner, *Without God, Without Creed*, 203.

⁴⁶ Robert Ingersoll, quoted in Eva Ingersoll Wakefield, *The Life and Letters of Robert G. Ingersoll* (London: Watts & Co., 1952), 6.

⁴⁷ Wakefield, *Life and Letters*, 1-6.

⁴⁸ Roger E. Greeley, ed., *Ingersoll: Immortal Infidel* (Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books, 1977), xi.

⁴⁹ Jacoby, *Freethinkers*, 158-64.

⁵⁰ "Col. Ingersoll's Popularity," *New York Sun*, 2 June 1888, 4.

⁵¹ Dr. Henry Field, *New York Evangelist*, 3 May 1888, 4.

⁵² Ingersoll, "To Mr. Gladstone," 601.

⁵³ "Gladstone and Ingersoll," *Chicago Daily Inter Ocean*, 29 April 1888, 4.

⁵⁴ "Mr. Gladstone on Bob Ingersoll," *Raleigh News and Observer*,

1 May 1888, col A.

⁵⁵ *New York Evangelist*, 17 May 1888, 4. The *North American Review* was sold for 50 cents compared with daily newspapers that generally sold for 2 cents.

⁵⁶ *New York Evangelist*, 31 May 1888, 4. Extra editions did not equal the number printed in the first run for regular subscribers. Extra editions commonly consisted of 500 copies but sometimes were not more than 250.

⁵⁷ *New York Evangelist*, 29 November 1888, 4.

⁵⁸ "Church Services Tomorrow," *Milwaukee Daily Journal*, 30 June 1888, col D.

⁵⁹ "The Magazines and Reviews," *The Methodist Review* 4:4 (1888), 622.

⁶⁰ "Gladstone on Ingersoll," *Philadelphia Inquirer*, 4 May 1888, 4.

⁶¹ Charles A. Littlefield, "Is it Wise?" *Zion's Herald*, 1 August 1888, 242.

⁶² Littlefield, "Is it Wise?" *Zion's Herald*, 242.

⁶³ *Methodist Review* 4:4 (1888), 622.

⁶⁴ Field, *New York Evangelist*, 3 May 1888, 4.

⁶⁵ "Gladstone and Ingersoll," *Zion's Herald*, 2 May 1888, 140.

⁶⁶ Gladstone, "Remarks," 491.

⁶⁷ "Mr. Gladstone on Mr. Ingersoll," *Christian Union*, 3 May 1888, 547.

⁶⁸ *Methodist Review*, 4:4 (1888), 622.

⁶⁹ Nym Crinkle, "Puncturing the Pagan," *Morning Oregonian*, 27 May 1888, col D.

⁷⁰ "Mr. Gladstone on Bob Ingersoll," *Raleigh News and Observer*, 1 May 1888, col A.

⁷¹ Mr. Gladstone on Bob Ingersoll," *Raleigh News and Observer*, 1 May 1888, col A.

⁷² W.M. Chandler, "He Stands Alone," *Boston Investigator*, 9 May 1888, 6.

⁷³ W.M. Chandler, "Gladstone vs. Ingersoll: A Lecture," *Boston*

Investigator, 13 June 1888, col. A.

⁷⁴ Chandler, "Gladstone vs. Ingersoll," col. A.

⁷⁵ Chandler, "Gladstone vs. Ingersoll," col. A.

⁷⁶ L.K. Washburn, "Christianity No Encouragement to Intelligence or Morality: A Lecture," *Boston Investigator*, 12 December 1888, col. A.

⁷⁷ Washburn, "Christianity No Encouragement to Intelligence or Morality," col. A.

⁷⁸ L.K. Washburn, "A Good Speech Not Reported," *Boston Investigator*, 6 June 1888, col. A.

⁷⁹ "Rome or Reason," *New York Times*, 16 September 1888, 4.

⁸⁰ "Gladstone and Ingersoll," *Milwaukee Daily Journal*, 7 May 1888, col. A.

⁸¹ "Gladstone and Ingersoll," *Milwaukee Daily Journal*, 7 May 1888, col. A.

⁸² "Gladstone and Ingersoll," *Milwaukee Daily Journal*, 7 May 1888, col. A.

⁸³ Gladstone, "Remarks," 491.

⁸⁴ "Gladstone and Ingersoll," *Milwaukee Daily Journal*, 7 May 1888, col. A.

⁸⁵ "News," *Atchison Daily Globe*, 30 June 1888, col. D.

⁸⁶ "Gladstone on Ingersoll," *Daily Inter Ocean*, 29 April 1888, 4.

⁸⁷ Gladstone, "Remarks," 482, 507.

⁸⁸ "Aggressive Infidelity Using its Advantage," *The Andover Review* 9:54 (1888), 639.

⁸⁹ "Aggressive Infidelity Using its Advantage," *Andover Review*, 642.

⁹⁰ Frederic H. Hedge, "Atheism," *Unitarian Review* 30:2 (1888), 122.

⁹¹ Elizabeth Stuart Phelps, "The Real Issues," *North American Review* 147:380 (1888), 2.

⁹² Phelps, "The Real Issues," 4.

⁹³ Phelps, "The Real Issues," 4.

⁹⁴ Frederick R. Courdert, "The Combatants," *North American Review* 147:380 (1888), 28.

⁹⁵ Courdert, "The Combatants," 29.

⁹⁶ Courdert, "The Combatants," 29.

⁹⁷ Courdert, "The Combatants," 31.

⁹⁸ Gladstone, "Remarks," 496-97.

⁹⁹ Ingersoll, "Col. Ingersoll to Mr. Gladstone," 623.

¹⁰⁰ Courdert, "The Combatants," 33.

¹⁰¹ Courdert, "The Combatants," 36.

¹⁰² Courdert, "The Combatants," 28.

¹⁰³ Courdert, "The Combatants," 36.

¹⁰⁴ "The Reply," *Boston Investigator*, 9 May 1888, 6.

