

**GUILTY: A TRIBUTE TO THE  
BOTTOM MAN: AND A PLAIN  
REPLY TO NOT GUILTY, A  
DEFENCE OF THE BOTTOM DOG,  
BY MR. R. BLATCHFORD**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649498772

Guilty: A Tribute to the Bottom Man: And a Plain Reply to Not Guilty, a Defence of the Bottom Dog, by Mr. R. Blatchford by Frank Ballard

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.  
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

[www.triestepublishing.com](http://www.triestepublishing.com)

**FRANK BALLARD**

**GUILTY: A TRIBUTE TO THE  
BOTTOM MAN: AND A PLAIN  
REPLY TO NOT GUILTY, A  
DEFENCE OF THE BOTTOM DOG,  
BY MR. R. BLATCHFORD**



# **GUILTY**

**A TRIBUTE TO THE BOTTOM MAN**

AND A PLAIN REPLY TO  
'NOT GUILTY A DEFENCE OF THE BOTTOM DOG,  
BY MR. R. BLATCHFORD

BY

**FRANK BALLARD**

M.A., B.D., B.Sc., F.R.M.S., ETC.

AUTHOR OF

'THE MIRACLES OF UNBELIEF,' 'CLARION FALLACIES,' 'WHICH BIBLE  
TO READ,' 'MARCEL'S MONISM FALSE,' 'THEOMONISM TRUE,' ETC.

**London**

**CHARLES H. KELLY**

2 CASTLE STREET, CITY ROAD, AND 26 PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

·BJ  
1461  
·B37  
1907

FIRST EDITION (5000) . . . *February 1907*  
SECOND EDITION (5000) . . . *February 1907*  
THIRD EDITION (5000) . . . *May 1907*

DEDICATED  
TO  
ALL MEN AND WOMEN  
WHO ARE  
OPEN TO REASON

## PREFACE

A VERY few words will suffice to explain the appearance of the following pages. In the book entitled *God and My Neighbour*, which has had a large sale in both paper and cloth editions, the writer gives some fifteen pages to the question 'Can man sin against God?' and styles this section of his work 'Determinism.' Feeling dissatisfied, apparently, with that exposition—as for many reasons he well might be—he issued later on a new series of articles in *The Clarion* dealing afresh, and at considerable length, with various phases of the subject. These were then embodied in a second book entitled *Not Guilty, a Defence of the Bottom Dog*. This, again, is now issued in a cheap paper edition, so that, in the author's words, 'cost may not stand in the way of those who wish to comprehend the new philosophy.' He also informs the general public that, in his opinion, this is 'the strongest, the clearest, the most human and the most useful book I have written.'

That such a work should in these days and in this country find readers and admirers to any extent worth regarding, is indeed significant, not only for Christian Churches, but for every English citizen and every man of sense or self-respect. Concerning Professor Haeckel's



popular work entitled *The Riddle of the Universe*,<sup>1</sup> Professor Paulsen, the well-known philosophical expert, said: 'I have read this book with burning shame—shame in regard to the general and philosophical culture of our people. That such a book should be possible, that it could be written, printed, bought, read, admired, accepted, by the nation possessing a Kant, a Goethe, a Schopenhauer, is painful indeed.' The same feeling must surely arise in the mind of any thoughtful man not already pledged to some anti-Christian programme, when he finds such a work as *Not Guilty* in vogue, printed and read, in the land of Milton and Shakespeare, Carlyle and Macaulay, Browning and Tennyson, Martineau and Gladstone. That the ethical principles for which all these, not to mention any others, stand, are to be swept away as less than the small dust of the balance by the confident self-assertions and superficial plausibilities of a popular journalist, is indeed startling to all who desire the well-being of their fellows, and especially to such as are watching, and are disposed to welcome, the development of modern democracy. If, as Mr. Cotter Morison asserts, and this book emphatically confirms, 'the sooner we get rid of moral responsibility the better,' then we are on the way back to social chaos rather than progressing towards a Golden Age.

The plain fact, however, that such things are printed and vigorously circulated, remains. It merits, indeed, decidedly more attention than it usually receives, either from lofty clericalism or self-complacent Nonconformity. If this writer's position be sound, there is not only an

<sup>1</sup> See *Haeckel's Monism False*, pp. 5, 138.

end of all Christianity, but also of all morality. The reasons for such an assertion, here deliberately made, will be found in the pages that follow. Its gravity, at least, is self-evident.

There are two ways in which the baneful influence of such popular appeals may be met. One is by insisting upon the main principles of true morality, especially as embodied in Christian ethics. This is sufficiently done, in general, by innumerable writers who are certainly not all annihilated by the hand-wave of a modern editor.

The other method, more tedious and uninviting, yet sometimes manifestly necessary, is to show, definitely and in detail, the errors of this self-styled 'new philosophy' and their mischievous significance. No one knows better than I do the thankless nature of such a task. However manifestly needed, it is as a rule no more appreciated by ordinary Churches than welcomed by unbelieving outsiders. One's general reward is simply to be pronounced 'controversial' or 'pugnacious' and the like. Setting that aside, it remains only too true that none are so blind as those that will not see. The general state of the case is that those inside the Churches will not face the questions involved; and those outside will not face the answers. Whether of the two is the wiser, or the more foolish, need not here be decided. Certainly, in regard to the latter, I find, whilst lecturing on these themes continually, little or no difficulty in answering questions, but ceaseless and almost insuperable difficulty in answering questioners.

Thus, on a recent occasion, the objector stated that he had read both the works here referred to and the

replies to them, but was just as much at sea as ever, 'with added sympathy for Mr. Blatchford.' He declined the opportunity to point out any mistakes or false statements in the preceding lecture—which embodied the following pages—but insisted that his 'general impression' was unfavourable to the Christian view of these matters. Such an attitude is only too typical, and must be left without characterization as being beyond human judgement. Neither in these pages nor elsewhere do I profess to give more than reasons for assertions. The ability or willingness to accept them, is a matter in which, as Paul said, 'every man will have to carry his own load.'<sup>1</sup>

Three points are here to be especially noted :

(1) With the personality of the writer of the book in question, I have nothing whatever to do. It matters not in the least who wrote it, whether the editor of *The Times*, or of *The Clarion*. For which reason it is quite unnecessary to keep on repeating the author's name. Such repetition becomes almost inevitably offensive. But it ought not to be necessary to point out that it is perfectly competent for any earnest thinker to criticize severely a published book, without being for that reason guilty of discourtesy to its writer. How sensitive, however, on his behalf are those who follow this writer's leadership, was illustrated recently when a hearer objected to 'the aspersions cast upon the character of the author of the book.' When pressed to give reasons for his feeling, he pleaded that in the course of the preceding lecture the phrase 'What-

<sup>1</sup> Gal. vi. 5 (Weymouth's translation).