

ADVERTISING SCHEDULE

First Page	100
Second Page	75
Third Page	50
Fourth Page	25
Small Ad	10

Entered at the Post Office at Wilmington, N. C., as Second Class Matter.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE.
The subscription price of the WEEKLY STAR is as follows:
Single Copy 1 year, postage paid, \$1.50
6 months, " " " 1.00
3 months, " " " .50

TARIFF INEQUALITIES.
It is certainly very important that the present generation of voters should inform themselves concerning the workings of the present High War Tariff that was foisted upon the country by the Republicans and has been kept upon the country burdening and stifling its energies in spite of the efforts of the true Democrats to reduce, readjust and equalize it. If people will not give some consideration to the Tariff they will be surprised to know how it oppresses them and what great losses they are by its iniquitous and unfair processes. If the voters generally understood the genuine wrongs and the needless burdens heaped upon them by the Republican Tariff they would not be so tame and indifferent under its operations.

As we said recently the taxpayer gives four, six or eight times more to the Federal Government in the way of taxes than he does to his State. He sweats and groans under the latter whilst willingly paying the former. How is this? There can be but one answer—one is hidden and indirect, the other is open and direct. The one is paid to merchants who have paid to the custom houses the dues; the other is paid directly to the sheriff without any intermediary.

Now for a lesson as to the way the War Tariff operates. Mr. Carroll D. Wright, Commissioner of the Federal Bureau of Labor, has published his first report, from which we propose to draw the lesson. Mr. Wright discusses at great length the causes of the general industrial depression both in the United States and in foreign countries. He discusses briefly what he calls "tariff inequalities." He confines himself in a very important table he gives to the woolen and mixed goods distributed from Leeds, England. The table shows the weight and width of thirty-six kinds of cloth, the prices at the factory, the tax per yard that Americans must pay under the War Tariff, and the cost delivered in New York exclusive of packing.

You can see from the table what Americans pay for the fun of keeping up a high war tax on foreign goods. The table shows another thing, and it concerns all men but the rich very much. It is this—the tax increases as the value of goods diminishes. The laboring man who wears cheap goods pays a great deal higher tax than the man who wears better goods—beaver or broadcloth, for instance. This is a great wrong. It is a great shame.

We avail ourselves of a carefully prepared article in the New York Times which significantly and happily—"Tariff Rates for the Poor." The Times discusses the table. It says:—
"We selected a few examples to show more clearly the force of the demonstration, the amount of figures being the price of the goods per yard in Leeds, and the second column showing how large a percentage of that price our duty is."

Goods	Price	Per Cent.
West of England broadcloth	\$3.00	60.9
West of England beaver	3.36	68.8
Best worsted coating	2.88	68.0
Best blue cloth	1.40	65.5
Ottoman, woolen and worsted	.83	73.0
Wool, fancy suiting	.94	72.0
Wool, fancy suiting	.70	103.7
Diagonal cloth	.76	107.0
Cotton-warp cloth	.64	120.5
Fancy overcoat (cotton-warp)	.82	123.7
Fancy overcoat (cotton-warp)	.73	127.0
Cotton warp coating	.40	128.3
Imitation serape	.56	144.1
Cotton-warp melon	.34	153.3
Cotton-warp serape	.48	167.1
Reversible diagonal	.48	179.1
Reversible nap	.44	179.1
Cotton-warp reversible	.45	180.7

"We would be different to present a group of facts relating to a single branch of manufacturing industry that would show more plainly that the tariff falls most heavily upon those who are unable to bear the burden of taxation. Of course, these rates are far in excess of what might be required to protect the labor employed in this country in making woolen and mixed cloth by covering the difference in wages. They would not compel the buyer in this country to buy cloth from Leeds and pay this tax upon it, but they do enable the maker of such cloth in the United States to charge high prices for his goods, and the poor man must buy them. This table is cited as an illustration of 'tariff inequality,' but it might well be used as an illustration of 'tariff iniquity.'"

Mr. Wright says of the necessity of Tariff readjustment and reform:—
"The law-making power can reform so that the tariff shall be regulated on the basis of justice and science, and not on a haphazard basis which affects only individual interests and oftentimes inflicts general harm."

He thinks that the tax should be

VOL. XVII.

adjusted to the cost of labor in production. But with such glaring oppressions, such monstrous inequalities before them there are thirty odd members in the House elected as Democrats who oppose the small measure of relief proposed under the Morrison bill. The War Tariff makes the poor man pay the heaviest while the rich have their hoarded stores increased by the same. The poor man must actually pay 180 per cent. on his cotton warp reversible cloth, while the wearer of West of England broadcloth pays but 50 per cent.

We always take an interest in the descendants of North Carolinians abroad. North Carolina has contributed many excellent citizens and active workers to other States. Some of the children, like their fathers, uphold the family name and even give new lustre to it. The first Doctor **Baill-Maury**, was born in Chatham. He was an eminent, useful, and able Baptist minister. He left his native State when quite a young man. He has a distinguished son, bearing his honored name, who has inherited much of his father's ability and zeal and as a man of profound scholarship. At the Baptist Convention held at Meridian, Miss., a week ago, in a speech he gave expression to the following noble and well rounded sentiments:

"Suppose another war was upon us that chaos would a soldierly armed with old time cannon and flintlock muskets stand against one with Gatling guns and Winchester repeating rifles and the multiplied facilities of education just as inventive genius has improved the implements of war, and he wanted Baptists to enter the fight against sin and the devil equipped not with the flintlock musket of ignorance, but with the repeating rifle of high and broad education."

We will explain why it is we have referred to Mr. Clark of New Bern, in connection with Democratic support. It is not Craven county alone that is concerned. If Mr. Clark's vote should be necessary to determine the fate of County Government in all Eastern Carolina some Democrats would be "mighty mad," and others would feel "very bad," if his vote should hand over twenty six negro counties into the keeping of "the same old set." That is why we do not look kindly on a ticket that might prove of serious injury to New Hanover and other counties as well as to the New Bern section. The STAR for this reason, has not been able to see the wisdom of selecting Mr. Clark, an estimable citizen and a man of talents, but who is open in his hostility to County Government. It is from no disposition to intermeddle, but to prevent serious detriment to the State and to this immediate section that we have ventured to say a word about the choice of Mr. Clark and the duty of Democrats.

We learn from the *Southern Biographer* for August that Paul H. Hayne was born last January, 1830. So he was in his 57th year as the STAR held. The *Biographer* says:—
"We should add here that Mr. Hayne had been invited to deliver next winter, at Vanderbilt University, a series of lectures on poetry or literature, a task in which he would have delighted, and for which he was ripe and full. It is a less serious and irreparable that these lectures will never be written, and that before the invitation had reached him he had belatedly passed laid down his pen forever."

This is a most interesting announcement. He would have delivered admirable lectures. We would like to read a lecture from him on Tennyson, whose poetry he loved above all others.

The Tory Cabinet has been partially formed and here it is:—
"Home Secretary—Lord George Hamilton; Chief Secretary for Ireland—Sir Michael Hicks-Beach; Secretary for Foreign Affairs—Earl of Iddelston; Chancellor of the Exchequer—Lord Randolph Churchill; Secretary of War—Right Hon. W. E. Smith; First Lord of the Admiralty—George Hamilton; Lord High Chancellor—Baron Salisbury; Secretary for India—Right Hon. Frederick Arthur Sturtevant; Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury—Marquis of Salisbury; Lord Lieutenant of Ireland—Marquis of Londonderry; Lord President of the Council—Viscount Cranbrook; President of the Board of Trade—Right Hon. Edward Stanhope; First Lord of the Treasury—Lord Randolph Churchill; Postmaster General—Lord John Manners; Lord Chancellor for Ireland—Lord Ashburnham."

The *Boston Post* is probably mistaken in claiming Judge Fowle, of Raleigh, as a native of Massachusetts. But of that we are not confident. It speaks positively as follows:—
"Judge Fowle is favorably known in Boston. He is a Northerner by birth. He was born in Woburn, and his father before kept it flying during the entire conflict. His grandfather, the Confederate, was by name Daniel, who was then a lawyer, and the Confederate was his father."

All Southern men are strong for the Union now.

Judge Thurman has been in Washington within a few days. Of John Goode, of Virginia, slaughtered by a Radical Senate, the noble old Democrat said that he was "a most able lawyer, and one of the purest and best men he ever knew." Yet this is the man that a Radical Senate tries to disgrace at the order of such a very little fellow as Mahone is known to be. Shame!

THE PREJUDICES OF THE NORTHERN PEOPLE AGAINST NEGROES ARE DEEPER AND WIDER THAN ANY THAT EXIST IN THE SOUTH.

The prejudices of the Northern people against negroes are deeper and wider than any that exist in the South. The whites here understand the negro character perfectly, and they are kindly disposed towards the inferior race. The Southern people desire to see the "man and brother" prosper and be happy, and this is shown in a thousand ways from January to December. The whites are intolerant and severe only when they propose by legislation to break down natural barriers, degrade the men of Caucasian blood and sow the seeds of discord between the races. The whites simply know that you cannot mix the two races socially or in the public schools without serious detriment to the dominant race and creating strife and bloodshed. Thus knowing, with all of the prejudice and resolved will that belong to the superior race of men, the Southern whites have resisted any attempt to bring about social degradation and equality, and will do so unto the bitter end.

We do not believe in needlessly calling up race issues or demanding that the color line in politics be drawn between the two races. Here, in North Carolina elections, the colored voters have nearly all been on one side and against the whites, amongst whom they toil and suffer and are happy. If there is to be an active party campaign in this year they will probably vote for the same old ticket. The whites, therefore, must hold together. Self-preservation is the first law of nature. If the negroes endeavor to put unworthy men in office who are hostile to the best interests of the State or the communities in which they live, then it is the duty of all white men to stand together for the common protection and safety. This is a white man's government and will be so to the end.

Up in the Republican State of Ohio there is a small excitement over mixing the two races in the schools. The STAR weeks ago published the particulars of the excitement at Springfield over the graduation of a negro girl and the withdrawal of all the white girls, and the attempt of certain niggerophiles, of the kind that would degrade their own race, to make a hero of the colored girl. It now appears that the School Board has decided that hereafter the two races shall attend separate schools. This is precisely in accordance with the "eternal fitness of things." The Southern common schools are for both races, and the funds are divided fairly according to the number of school children, and the same provisions are made for both races.

The colored people in Ohio are said to be much stirred. But they ought to have sense enough to know that it is best for both races that they be kept separate. The *Charleston News and Courier* says of the Ohio matter:—
"It is really very strange, the prejudice that is manifested towards the colored people in Northern States during three years out of every four. Can it be possible, after all, that civil rights, in that section, is a quadrilateral plant and blooms only in Presidential years? It seems so."

AN OILY CONTENT.
Representative Allen, of the Eighth District in Massachusetts, has arrayed against him the whole army of oleomargarine workers. He was very active in securing the passage of the very offensive and dangerous bill that sought to build up one industry by suppressing another industry. The makers of butter from beef ribs are in arms against the man who stands by the rancid productions of udder and dairy. The milk-buttermen are rallying around the flag of Allen, wholly indifferent to the injustice and unconstitutionality of the bill, and a lively fight is expected all along the line. It is a battle between the rib and the udder. It is expected that every man shall do his duty. If oleomargarine wins the day then the electors of the Eighth Massachusetts will have decided that it is wrong in principle and dangerous in application of a law that aims death at one industry that a rival industry may flourish and smelt with all the strength of a rancid production. The Massachusetts man will hardly so pronounce as this is a beautiful application of the principle of Protection all flowered and "run to seed."

The *New York Times* says:—
"We need not blame the oleomargarine men for fighting with all the weapons at their command. They are made the victims of a tax imposed ostensibly for revenue, and they have the right of every other specially taxed class to agitate for the removal of their burden, and to do so by defeating members of Congress who have helped to put the burden upon them, if they can. As a correspondent suggests, they are in the same position in which the makers of shoddy would be if they were taxed in the interest of the makers of woolen cloth. The right and interest of the makers of shoddy is the same. They are to know what the public buying, and not to have shoddy offered to us for cloth, and to be made the victims of it. The whole effect of the statute, so far as it has any effect, is to raise the price of oleomargarine to the consumer, and by consequence the price also of its competing product, butter."

The British press opinions of the new Irish Viceroys are not particularly enthusiastic.

A HERETORIOUS THEOLOGICAL WORK.

Some thirty years ago a little book was published in England entitled "The Tongue of Fire." It was widely read both in that country and in our own. It was written by a Wesleyan minister named William Arthur. He has written several other books, but none has attracted attention in the United States. He has, however, just published a work of marked excellence, we may suppose, and for that reason we call attention to it. It is entitled "Religion Without God and God Without Religion." It can be bought of Thomas Whittaker, New York, for \$1.85. Our reason for proposing the book uncommonly meritorious without having read it is two-fold: first, the author is a man of considerable originality, force and eloquence; second, we have before us the opinion of the able and scholarly critic of the *New York Churchman*. He says:—

"It is with a feeling of great contentment that a believer lays down these books. In the first place there is no small satisfaction in seeing one set of denials overthrown by another set. Mr. Arthur has contrived to make evident the fact that unbelievers in any city or in any land, but like that picture by Dore, in which each warrior in the act of shooting or stabbing his foe, was himself pierced by another. In the next place the cloudy philosophies of Agnosticism and the patent schemes of Positivism are treated in a broad, commonsense and practical way which at times almost anticipates the best of the thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried to a triumph perfection. There is a fine and subtle sarcasm in the words of Sir Fitzgibbon, which if he as good as the other two, will leave little to be desired in the way of defence of Christianity. As a rule such apologetics are heavy, but thoroughly destructive in its work upon the enemy's position. We have never seen a better exposition of the refutation of an unbeliever's argument. The *reductio ad absurdum*, especially in Mr. Spencer's case, is carried