

VOL. VII.

NOVEMBER (E. M.) 289.

No. 11.

THE
FREETHINKERS'

MAGAZINE.

H. L. GREEN. . EDITOR & PUBLISHER.

Published Monthly.

20cts. Single Number. \$1 Six Months.
\$2 Per Annum.

143 MAIN STREET.
BUFFALO, N. Y.

A. D. 1889.

The Courier Company. Printers.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
GIORDANO BRUNO. By Robert G. Ingersoll, - - - - -	477
THE SOURCE OF ECONOMIC LAW. By Prof. Thomas Davidson, - - - - -	480
THE BRUNO CELEBRATION AND THE PAPAL ALLOCUTION. By Edmund Montgomery, M. D., - - - - -	488
ONLY ONE WORLD AFTER ALL!—BUT THAT INFINITE. By T. B. Wakeman, - - - - -	491
HOW TO BE GOOD THOUGH GODLESS. By Hugh O. Pentecost, - - - - -	493
WHY WAS BRUNO MURDERED? By George Jacob Holyoake, - - - - -	500
THE MYTH OF THE GREAT DELUGE (Continued). By James M. McCann, - - - - -	502
 LITERARY DEPARTMENT:	
Giordano Bruno. By Emma Root Tuttle, - - - - -	508
The Followers of the Meek and Lowly One, - - - - -	509
What the Good Friends Say, - - - - -	510
The One Hundred, - - - - -	515
 EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT:	
John E. Remsburg, - - - - -	516
The Freethinkers' Magazine, Vol., VIII., 290, - - - - -	520
All Sorts, - - - - -	522
Book Review, - - - - -	524

TWENTIETH CENTURY

Devoted to Secular Religion and Social Regeneration.

HUGH O. PENTECOST, EDITOR.

T. L. MCCREADY, ASSOCIATE EDITOR.

Our Motto: "*Hear the other side.*"

The only so-called "Liberal" paper that is in favor of radical social regeneration.

Among its contributors are leading Single-taxers, Socialists, Anarchists, Protectionists, Free-traders, Agnostics, Christians, Hebrews, Spiritualists and Materialists. Some of them are:

EDWARD BELLAMY,	WM. M. SALTER,	Rev. J. C. F. GRUMBINE,
Rev. JOHN CHADWICK,	ELLA STEVENS,	Rev. JOHN HALL, D. D.
Rev. W. S. CROWE,	DAN'L DELEON, Ph. D.,	Rev. JAMES M. WHITON,
Rev. HENRY FRANK,	CLINTON FURBISH,	Hon. FRANK T. REID,
Rabbi G. GOTTHIEL,	DYER D. LUM,	JAMES H. WEST,
Rev. J. C. KIMBALL,	M. M. MANGASARIAN,	Gen. M. M. TRUMBULL,
SAM'L J. McDONALD,	W. L. SHELDON,	VICTOR YARROS.
Rev. R. HEBER NEWTON,	A. VAN DEUSEN,	

Elegantly printed on fine white paper. Issued weekly. 16 pages. \$2.00 a year. Sample copies free.

Twentieth Century Publishing Co., No. 4 Warren Street,
NEW YORK CITY.

Entered in the Post-office at Buffalo, N. Y., as second-class matter.

THE FREETHINKERS' MAGAZINE.

NOVEMBER (E. M.) 289.

GIORDANO BRUNO.

By ROBERT G. INGERSOLL.

THOSE WHO OBJECT TO THE MONUMENT JUSTIFY THE MURDER.

THE night of the Middle Ages lasted for a thousand years. The first star that enriched the horizon of this universal gloom was Giordano Bruno. He was the herald of the dawn.

He was born in 1550, was educated for a priest, became a Dominican friar. At last his reason revolted against the doctrine of transubstantiation. He could not believe that the entire Trinity was in a wafer, or in a swallow of wine. He could not believe that a man could devour the Creator of the universe by eating a piece of bread. This led him to investigate other dogmas of the Catholic Church, and, in every direction, he found the same contradictions and impossibilities supported, not by reason, but by faith.

Those who love their enemies threatened his life. He was obliged to flee from his native land, and he became a vagabond in nearly every nation of Europe. He declared that he fought not what priests believed, but what they pretended to believe. He was driven from his native country because of his astronomical opinions. He had lost confidence in the Bible as a scientific work. He was in danger because he had discovered a truth.

He fled to England. He gave some lectures at Oxford. He found that institution controlled by the priests. He found that

they were teaching nothing of importance—only the impossible and hurtful. He called Oxford “The Widow of true learning.” There were in England, at that time, two men who knew more than the rest of the world. Shakespeare was then alive.

Bruno was driven from England. He was regarded as a dangerous man,—he had opinions, he inquired after reasons, he expressed confidence in facts. He fled to France. He was not allowed to remain in that country. He discussed things—that was enough. The Church said, “Move on.” He went to Germany. He was not a believer—he was an investigator. The Germans wanted believers; they regarded the whole Christian system as settled; they wanted witnesses; they wanted men who would assert. So he was driven from Germany.

He returned at last to his native land. He found himself without friends, because he had been true, not only to himself, but to the human race. But the world was false to him because he refused to crucify the Christ of his own soul between the two thieves of hypocrisy and bigotry. He was arrested for teaching that there are other worlds than this; that many of the stars are suns, around which other worlds revolve; that Nature did not exhaust all her energies on this grain of sand called the earth. He believed in a plurality of worlds, in the rotation of this, in the heliocentric theory. For these crimes, and for these alone, he was imprisoned for six years. He was kept in solitary confinement. He was allowed no books, no friends, no visitors. He was denied pen and paper. In the darkness, in the loneliness, he had time to examine the great questions of origin, of existence, of destiny. He put to the test what is called the goodness of God. He found that he could neither depend upon man nor upon any deity. At last the Inquisition demanded him. He was tried, condemned, excommunicated and sentenced to be burned.

According to Professor Draper, he believed that this world is animated by an intelligent soul—the cause of forms, but not of matter; that it lives in all things, even in such as seem not to live; that everything is ready to become organized; that matter is the mother of forms, and then their grave; that matter and the soul of things, together, constitute God. He was a Pantheist—that is to say, an Atheist. He was a lover of nature,—a reaction from the asceticism of the Church. He loved the fields, the

woods, the streams. He said to his brother-priests: Come out of your cells, out of your dungeons; come into the air and light. Throw away your beads and your crosses. Gather flowers; mingle with your fellow-men; have wives and children; scatter the seeds of joy; throw away the thorns and nettles of your creeds; enjoy the perpetual miracle of Life.

On the seventeenth of February, in the year of grace 1600, by the triumphant beast, the Church of Rome, this philosopher, this great and splendid man, was burned. He was offered his liberty if he would recant. There was no God to be offended by his recantation, and yet, as an apostle of what he believed to be the truth, he refused this offer. To those who passed the sentence upon him he said: "It is with greater fear that ye pass this sentence upon me than I receive it." This man, greater than any naturalist of his day, grander than the martyr of any religion, died willingly in defense of what he believed to be the sacred truth. He was great enough to know that real religion will not destroy the joy of life on earth; great enough to know that investigation is not a crime—that the really useful is not hidden in the mysteries of faith. He knew that the Jewish records were below the level of the Greek and Roman myths; that there is no such thing as special providence; that prayer is useless; that liberty and necessity are the same, and that good and evil are but relative.

He was the first real martyr,—neither frightened by perdition, nor bribed by heaven. He was the first of all the world who died for truth without expectation of reward. He did not anticipate a crown of glory. His imagination had not peopled the heavens with angels waiting for his soul. He had not been promised an eternity of joy if he stood firm, nor had he been threatened with the fires of hell if he recanted. He expected as his reward an eternal nothing. Death was to him an everlasting end—nothing beyond but a sleep without a dream, a night without a star, without a dawn—nothing but extinction, blank, utter and eternal. No crown, no palm, no "Well done, good and faithful servant," no shout of welcome, no song of praise, no smile of God, no kiss of Christ, no mansion in the fair skies—not even a grave within the earth—nothing but ashes, wind-blown and priest-scattered, mixed with the earth and trampled beneath the feet of men and beasts.

The murder of this man will never be completely and perfectly avenged until from Rome shall be swept every vestige of priest and pope, until over the shapeless ruin of St. Peter's, the crumbled Vatican and the fallen cross, shall rise another monument to Bruno,—the thinker, philosopher, philanthropist, pantheist, and martyr.

THE SOURCE OF ECONOMIC LAW.*

BY PROF. THOMAS DAVIDSON.

ORTHODOX Political Economy is the science of the gratification of unregulated desires for material things. It champions these desires, as far as existing legal restriction permits, without ever inquiring whether they are good or evil, sane or morbid, human or beastly. It inquires only whether they are selfish or unselfish, and, if they are unselfish, it refuses to deal with them. It assumes the spring of all production and all distribution to be individual, selfish desires, and in its doctrine of *laissez-faire*, *laissez-passer*, it claims entire freedom for these desires to seek their own satisfaction. It regards man as subject to the same law which evolutionists hold to govern the animal world, the law of the survival of the fittest in a brutal struggle for existence.

The theories advanced by this science, when put in practice, have so shocked the humane feelings and moral convictions of all men endowed with such feelings and convictions, that it has for some time been falling into disrepute, and calling forth opposition. The dissenters, at first, did not venture to attack the theories, so great were their *prestige*, but contented themselves with seeking legal restrictions to limit their practical application. Hence came all the laws relating to child-labor, the hours of labor for adults, etc. Hence also have come trades' unions and similar combinations, whose aim is to limit the force of the caprice of individuals, and prevent the weaker competitors in the struggle from being driven to the wall. The next step was to formulate the principle underlying these movements, and this was, virtually, a protest against the theories themselves, or, at least, against that of *laissez-faire*, *laissez-passer*. This was done by the adherents

* Read before the American Social Science Association, at Saratoga, Sept. 6, 1889.

of what may be called the New Political Economy, whose principles found expression in the organization of the American Economic Association in this city four years ago. The distinguishing mark of this Political Economy is that it admits the validity of the principle of *laissez-faire* only in so far as it does not conflict with that universal well-being, which it is the aim of the social order to make possible. It insists that universal weal has a claim prior to that of individual caprice, and therefore calls upon the state to limit the manifestations of the latter in favor of the former.

Socialism (or Nationalism) endeavors to carry the tendency of the new economy to its last results. It rejects *in toto* the doctrine of *laissez-faire*, *laissez-passer*, and calls upon the state to regulate both production and distribution in view of the public welfare. It would put a stop to industrial competition and private enterprise, and turn the nation into a single family, providing for its material wants as a whole. Socialism is thus merely the natural reaction against the individualism of *laissez-faire*, and has been provoked by it.

But, after all, socialism does not strike at the root of the difficulty. It is a reaction against an effect, and not against the cause or principle, of the orthodox economy. The doctrine of *laissez-faire*, which it combats, is only a logical outcome of the principle that selfish desire is the spring of all production and all distribution. Any system of economy that may hope to bring order and justice into our present chaotic and oppressive condition must go deeper and deny the truth of this principle itself. And indeed there is not the slightest reason why it should not be denied, since it was, from the first, a mere hypothesis, a groundless assumption, slowly, imperceptibly, and in part surreptitiously converted into a dogma which, like other dogmas, strove to make up for what it lacked in truth by arrogant self-assertion. By this blustering method it has succeeded in so overawing the great majority of economists that they have come to look upon any doubt or questioning with regard to it as a college of cardinals would look upon unbelief in the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception or the Holy Trinity. To question the dogma would lead discussion into the field of ethics, and they are never tired of telling us that ethics and economics must be kept scrupulously apart, if we are to arrive at correct results in economics.

Now, it must be frankly admitted that there is no greater harm than always comes of wasted labor, in trying to find out what sort of political economy would be necessarily evolved on the hypothesis that selfish desire was the sole spring of industry ; but the harm is incomparably greater when this hypothesis is taken to be a fact which must not be questioned, on penalty of running economics back into ethics and so spoiling them. Even if it were possible to admit that the spring of all industry in times past had been selfish desire, and that on this hypothesis alone could its character be explained, it would by no means follow that this ought to be its spring in times to come, unless at the same time it could be shown that human nature is incapable of progress or evolution, and that, having been selfish in the past, it must always remain selfish. Looking at the false results of past and present industrial systems—results from which we are now trying to escape—we should rather be driven to question the correctness of a principle which led to such economic absurdities. If political economy be, as I assume it to be, the science of those methods of production and distribution of material wealth which promote the highest comfort and freedom of all the citizens of a state, then our present condition is an economic absurdity, and ought, if we had any logic in us, to drive us to the conclusion that its principle is false and always has been. Any principle which, when applied, leads to an absurdity must be itself absurd.

When we reflect that fundamental dogma of orthodox economics—that selfish desire is, and ought to be, the spring of industry—is a purely ethical proposition, it is, to say the least, a suspicious circumstance, when economists object to having that proposition discussed in the science of ethics. Surely a principle held to govern any branch of human activity cannot be withdrawn from the domain of the science whose office it is to deal with such principles, viz., from ethics without the tacit admission that that activity is conducted on unethical principles. We should have a very poor opinion of geometry, if geometers objected to having the fundamental concepts and axioms of their science discussed by metaphysicians and logicians ; and there is in all right-minded men a growing distrust of any religion which seeks to withdraw its dogmas from philosophical discussion on the ground that philosophy vitiates religion.

When we have moral courage enough to defy the assumed authority of orthodox economy and bring its fundamental dogma before the tribunal of ethics, which means reason applied to human action, we find that it had the best of selfish reasons for seeking to avoid that tribunal. It has not a single plea to offer in its own defense. Selfish desire is the very root of moral evil, and stands self-condemned, and its condemnation carries with it that of orthodox political economy, and of all the economics that admit, openly or tacitly, its principle. They are all plants springing from the root of moral evil.

It is no palliation of the enormity of the principle in question to say, as is often said, that in practice it results in good, through the balancing of opposing selfishness. It is true that nothing has results altogether evil, for the reason that nothing altogether evil can be at all; but the results of any course of action based on selfish desire are about as evil as anything can be, and be at all. This is attested by the present condition of our industrial system, which for some time has been threatening—perhaps we might rather say promising—to go out of existence. When its measure is full it will go out and be replaced by another based upon another ethical principle.

What this principle will be we may not be able, with certainty, to prophesy; but we may, without difficulty, say what it ought to be. If it be true that all ethical action, whatever else it may be, is action performed with due regard to the highest interests of all mankind, and that all human action ought to be ethical, then the ruling principle of the political economy of the future will be, not selfish desire, but as nearly as possible its exact opposite, viz., desire for universal well-being. Men tried in vain for ages to bring order into the planetary system, on the supposition that all the planets revolved round their own little earth. They succeeded only when they cast aside that supposition and assumed that the earth moved round the sun. The same change of view will have to take place with respect to the economic world. Thus far we have tried to solve its problems on the supposition that humanity revolved round the individual, and the problems have remained unsolved. We have now to try the supposition that the individual revolves round humanity, and one may safely prophesy that, when we do this, both theoretically and practically, we shall find the problems of economics as simple as Kepler did those of astronomy.

We must not forget, however, that there is this great difference between astronomic and economic laws, that, whereas the former, being laws of an absolute and unerring intelligence, which can have no aim but universal good, are natural laws—laws of what is, the latter, being laws for a relative and partial intelligence, are ethical laws—laws of what ought to be. Hence, while we can verify the laws of astronomy by investigating the courses of the stars, we cannot verify those of economics by investigating the course of industry, the history of which is, in great part, a record of breaches of ethical law. If the stars had wills of their own, astronomy would not be a natural science.

It is the fundamental error of the orthodox economy, and no less of all the systems of economics that have thus far sought to replace it, that they either ignore the distinction between natural and ethical law, or else seek to range themselves under the former, while, in fact, they belong under the latter. They assume a natural force, viz., selfish desire, which, they hold, performs the same function in economics that gravitation does in astronomy. Now, while it may be admitted that selfishness is a natural and brute force, it cannot be admitted that it is a force that ought to rule any department of human activity. All such activity ought to be governed by ethical law, which is essentially unselfish. And by "unselfishness" I do not mean altruism, which is an ethical absurdity. I mean that quality which makes a man desire to be great, not as an isolated individual, but as a member of society. But great as a member of society means great in the service of society, and this implies generosity, nobility, self-sacrifice, labor. "Whosoever would be great among you, shall be your servant"—this is the law of true, unselfish greatness.

At the risk of exposing myself to the derision of all political economists, orthodox and other, I wish to maintain that the problems of political economy will never receive a solution that practical application will justify, until we withdraw the whole of science from the domain of natural law and assign it to that of ethical law. Industry, like every other branch of human activity, must be regarded as a subject of ethics. Reduced to practice, this means that, in every industrial transaction, the first question for each man must be, not Will it profit one? but, Is it right? that is, Will it conduce to universal good? Under these circumstances some considerable changes will take place. Supply

and demand will no longer mean supply of materials to satisfy selfish demands, or low, unregulated desires, but supply of things demanded by a moral intelligence. Then will naturally cease the production and distribution of all foods and drinks injurious to health, of all objects of enervating luxury, of all meretricious art objects, of all unclean and sensational literature, and so on. Thus many of the most burning questions which puzzle sociologists, and the Gordian knot of which they seek to cut by prohibitory legislation, will solve themselves. We must never forget that the need for legislation is always a proof that society is living according to immoral principles. In this respect legislation is like charity, which always proves that there is something morally wrong in our economic condition.

I hold, then, that an ethical reform is the prior condition of any possible economic reform having any chance of permanency, and that, when the first is accomplished, the second will follow from it naturally. It is the old command, the meaning of which we have hardly yet begun to learn: "Seek ye *first* the Kingdom of God and His righteousness and all these things shall be added unto you." "The Kingdom of God and His righteousness"—what is that but a social state governed by absolute justice or moral law? "These things," what are they? The things which the nations seek, saying, "What shall we eat? What shall we drink? Wherewith shall we be clothed?" Whatever else our present political economy, orthodox and unorthodox, may be, it is certainly utterly unchristian, and I can imagine no more loathsome mockery than for a man, who pretends to worship the Christian God, to bow down before the Mammon of Political economy.

Here two very pertinent questions present themselves: (1) By what means shall the needed moral reformation be accomplished? (2) What shall we do, meanwhile, in regard to the unethical remedial measures which we now seek to introduce by legislation?

As to the first, I would answer briefly: By making moral education the beginning, the middle, and the end of all education. Since human life is human only in so far as it is moral, morality, character, ought to be the determining element in all education. How far this is from being the case at present, especially in our public schools, I need not tell you. Our schools attempt but little more than to furnish children with the requisite preparation

for obtaining what is called a "decent livelihood," in a social order governed by the orthodox economic principle of selfish desire. And even this preparation is absurdly inadequate, a fact that is now almost universally admitted. Protests against it are coming from all quarters, and a notable attempt has been made to supplement it by the establishment of manual training schools, which are good so far as they go. Indeed, we are ready to do everything but the one thing we ought to do, which is to abandon altogether the fundamental principle of our political economy and adopt, both in theory and practice, one exactly opposite to it. Then, instead of making it the chief aim of education to prepare men and women to struggle in an economic order whose first principle is selfishness or rascality, we shall use all our efforts to inculcate an ideal of perfect manhood and perfect citizenship. We shall not crush ambition, but we shall change its aim. We shall say to the rebellious youth or maiden: Strive not to place yourself in a position where you can command the services of others, but in one where you can best serve others. We shall write over the doors of our schools: "Whosoever would become great among you shall be your servant," and over those of our churches:

"He who feeds men serveth few;
He serves all who dares be true."

In order to bring about this reform in education, the first thing to be done, I believe, is to establish a normal school for the training of teachers in the theory, and, as far as may be, the daily practice of ethics, a school in which the formation of character shall be the chief aim. Such a school will teach nearly all the branches now taught in schools, and others besides, but it will teach them in a different order and with a different purpose. Such a school will of necessity form a community with practical interests enough to give opportunity for the exercise of virtue and the development of character. Indeed, not only normal schools, but all schools, ought to be communities, miniature commonwealths or states, as they were in the Middle Age. How otherwise can they impart the preparation necessary for civil life?

An ethical normal school, such as I have spoken of, will send forth men and women to go as missionaries, preaching the ethical gospel and establishing ethical schools in a heathen world, that still lives according to the economic gospel. For ethics has taken a better revenge for its exclusion from economics by with-

drawing from life altogether, and leaving human conduct to be estimated in terms of profit and loss, and not of right and wrong.

I have used the words "missionaries" and "gospel" on purpose, because I think we have reached a point in ethical and economic confusion when a new gospel has to be preached, and this gospel will require missionaries and apostles, servants of servants, men and women ready for every sacrifice in behalf of the truth, as truly as did the ethical gospel of 1800 years ago. We need a new baptism of fire, a new transmissible consecration, and until this comes—and it will not come until we demand it for ourselves—our efforts at reform will be futile for the most part. It is just as true now as it was of old, that man shall not live by bread alone, or even by bread with plenty of butter, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God; that is, by righteousness and true religion.

As to the second question: What shall we do meanwhile, that is, until the ethical enthusiasm can be fairly started? Shall we legislate and combine in detail against the effects of the selfish principle which so many justify in the abstract, or shall we leave it, to exhibit the full measure of its abomination unchecked? I have little doubt that the latter course would discredit the principle soonest, but I fear the cost in human life would be too great, and that we must go on applying legal plasters to the festering sores of society, while the specific that shall purify its life-blood is being prepared. I am, therefore, in favor not only of legislation against child-labor, over-work, and so on, but even of the new economy which defends this in principle, as against the doctrine of *laissez-faire*. Nay, although I cannot regard socialism or nationalism as anything more than a temporary expedient to mitigate effects, while it leaves the cause untouched, or, at best, an attempt to reach the cause by dealing with effects, just as if one should seek to stop a leak by drinking the water, I am not prepared to condemn it, and am free to say that I believe we shall have to go through it. While I do not for a moment believe that it will accomplish the good which its adherents expect from it, it will have this very beneficial result, that it will finally make clear, even to the blindest and most prejudiced, that no measure of success is to be hoped for from any economic reform which has not for its presupposition an ethical reform. If state socialism or nationalism were the law of the land to-morrow (and it may be so

before many morrows are over), and men were no more ethical than they are to-day, selfishness would find means to exploit and oppress ignorance, weakness, simple honesty and unselfishness, as much as it does now, if not more. We have a law forbidding chattel slavery, and what has it done? It has merely forced selfishness to introduce another form of slavery, which unblushingly calls itself freedom, and leaves the slave in many respects worse off than he was under the older system, and the master more recklessly selfish.

My conclusion is that no reform can help us in any way, save an ethical and a religious reform; that not the Law which curbs outward manifestations of selfishness, but the gospel which uproots selfishness, is the demand of the time.

THE BRUNO CELEBRATION AND THE PAPAL ALLOCUTION.

BY EDMUND MONTGOMERY, M. D.

AT Rome, despite the most strenuous protestations on the part of the Vatican, on the very spot where 300 years ago he suffered unflinching martyrdom, a monument now glorifies the memory of Giordano Bruno, the undaunted pioneer of modern Freethought.

The world over, the inauguration of the Bruno monument was felt as a solemn asseveration of the supreme sovereignty of free rational conviction, ruthlessly quelled in him who sublimely upheld it "to his last breath."

The host of liberal-minded votaries assembled on that momentous occasion in the Eternal City celebrated—symbolized in the person of the sacrificed thinker—the final triumph of natural truth, even when proclaimed only by one solitary tortured and silenced voice, against the overmastering decrees of absolute power, and the deafening clamor of popular prejudice. It celebrated the victory of actual facts, scientifically ascertained, over arbitrary decisions, tyrannically imposed. It averred the indefeasible right of individual thought to probe unhindered the solemn mystery of existence.

The joyous waving, on that memorable day, of the liberal colors in the city of cities, where rational thought had so long been stifled, signalized in verity the emancipation of Christianized

humanity from its ignominious enthrallment by a once all-powerful hierarchy. It signalized deliverance from the arrogant sway of a mean lot of stagnated superstitions, forcibly stamped on the plastic mind of youth, and inculcated all through life by nonsensical dogmas and crazy mummeries. In essence it was a festival of recovered sanity after centuries of artificially sustained alienation.

And as if most impressively to emphasize the vital importance of the great Freethought demonstration, Leo XIII.—from infancy a hypnotized vehicle of Catholic influences—displays in his recent ravings against the Bruno celebration all symptoms of that kind of insanity which total abandonment to superstitious fancies inevitably breeds. For it is a genuine species of madness to be so completely absorbed in a narrow set of fixed ideas as furiously to contest the right of others to refrain from likewise conforming to it. There is, indeed, no essential difference, save in the power of doing harm, between a madman in an insane asylum believing and maintaining that he is almighty and a pope insisting vehemently and in dead earnest that he is the infallible head of an infallible church.

The present "Vicar of Christ," as a true representative of what Catholicism still and again aims to be, seems absolutely incapable of appreciating honest doubt; much less of conceiving it possible that truth may be found anywhere outside his own church. Every dissension from its authoritative teachings is to him a sinful and punishable aberration; nay, a heinous and deadly crime. Bruno was, as he states, "judicially convicted of heresy, and rebellious to the church to his last breath"; consequently he well deserved his fate. And those who dare question the justice of the sentence and express their sympathy with the mode of thinking of the odious heretic, "surpass themselves in audacity," and, consistently, should suffer a like punishment.

This, unmistakably, is the innermost conviction of the "highly refined" and "gentle" incumbent of the Holy See; and this at a time when no sensible person doubts the truth of that which principally was called Bruno's heresy: the now commonplace truth that the universe contains innumerable worlds; and when, moreover, the belief in the presence of creative power within every part of this vast universe seems to candid thinkers at least as pious a creed as that of divine management from without.

Entire nations, that but lately were contending in deadly strug-

gle within themselves or against one another, for what each combatant deemed their proper rights, find at last in the natural tendencies and interests of their common humanity the terms of reconciliation. But Romish superstition stands generation after generation, stubbornly unmoved in its denial and defiance of the rights of others. Romish hatred remains forever implacable, ready to blot out of existence by any available means whatever it encounters in its way.

The man who habitually curses all who refuse to bend their free thought under his despotic yoke, damning them with a will to eternal torture, feels, forsooth, outraged at being good-naturedly laughed at in return. What a contrast of spirit—the Freethinker's compassionate laugh in answer to the prelate's fiendish curse!

Contemplating, however, the latest outburst of papal wrath, one can almost realize the sentiment that urged Voltaire, at a time when Romish hatred had still power effectively to vent its spite, unceasingly to reiterate his sibyllistic exhortation, "*Écrasez l'infame!*"

Because in barbarous times his sect took it upon itself to burn men alive for their opinions, Leo XIII. cannot contain his rage, that at the present day there are so many people in the world who do not refrain from expressing their abhorrence of such treatment, and their joy that at last the despotic spell is broken. In strangely furious terms he denounces the Bruno celebration: "We declare that Rome has been outraged, and the sanctity of the Christian faith has been odiously violated; and with grief and indignation we denounce to the entire Christian world the sacrilegious crime."

And listen how the mild-minded and humble Vicar of Christ sounds the tocsin for open revolt: "Catholics must be admonished, that it is wrong for them to sleep in the face of such perils, or to combat them tamely; they must, on the contrary, be courageous in professing their faith, firm in defending it, ready to make promptly for it all the sacrifices that circumstances demand."

After hearing this thinly-cloaked appeal to force, can any one doubt that, if there were a possible chance for a Catholic victory, the Romish plotters would not hesitate a moment to incite fratricidal war on the hugest scale and at any cost?

In defense against this renewed self-revelation of the Catholic

spirit, it behooves us to beware of its growing power in this country; to keep alive, above all, to its traitorous conspiracy of capturing the schools, therewith to reduce again to unquestioning imbecility and submission the coming generations.

ONLY ONE WORLD AFTER ALL!—BUT THAT INFINITE.

By T. B. WAKEMAN.

DR. PAUL CARUS is editing the *Open Court*, at Chicago, and has put out a little book* called "FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEMS," which would bring mankind great relief if they could learn the general view of the world inculcated in it. The relief consists in getting us free from the incubus of "another world." There is no end to the trouble the supposed "other world" has caused, and nothing is a greater advantage to mankind than the discovery which first broke in upon the mind of poor Giordano Bruno, and which threw him into an ecstasy of delight, viz.: that there is and can be only one infinite world, of which "the circumference is nowhere and the center everywhere." Thus Bruno laid the foundation of modern Pantheism and Monism, which is only saying, that God *and* the World are one Infinite Being or Existence, and that its proper mathematical notation is not 0, or 1, or 2, but ∞ . The world does not end in a vacuum 0, or a limit 1, or a duality 2, but is every way boundless. The issue between Bruno and the Pope was just this question, whether the world was finite and created or infinite and uncreatable, and on that question Bruno was burned. The Pope and all theology rests upon the notion of a God extra-mundane, *outside* of the world, who created it and *therefore* made it finite. If, as Bruno said, the world is infinite, no space or time is conceivable when and where it did not exist, and no God is conceivable outside of it in any time, place or manner. God and the *Infinite* World are therefore necessarily one. There can be no Theism, but Pantheism. So Spinoza taught and Goethe sung, and all the great men in thought of the world are following their lead; as Haeckel implies, *Monism* is the word of Science which separates the new, true

* FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEMS: THE METHOD OF PHILOSOPHY AS A SYSTEMATIC ARRANGEMENT OF KNOWLEDGE. By Dr. Paul Carus. Open Court Publishing Co., Chicago, Ill. Pp. 100. Price, \$1.00. For sale at this office.

world from the old and false idea about it. This idea sheds a world of light over every question of human life, and to realize it is to get a new heaven, a new earth, and a new life. There can be no world and no life that is not a continuance of the present. There can be no other world than ours—for that is, was and will be infinite. Our intellect may make a duism, and our art a trinitism, but at bottom *all is infinite*. How fruitful this infinite-world conception is, Dr. Carus has begun to teach us in his little work above named, and in the *Open Court*, and it argues little for the progress of American philosophy that many of the reviews of his work in other Liberal and Scientific periodicals disclose but slight apprehension of the novelty, purport or importance of the monistic view when applied to religion and morals. It is really the infinite and *real* phase of the Positive Philosophy. It readjusts all our ideas of the world and our motives in it, and, *as a part* of it, upon a scientific basis, viz., our relations to the world as All, and to Humanity as a part of that world. What we *ought to do* is determined by the scientific knowledge of these relations. The result is a Scientific Religion, Philosophy and Morality, leading to positive and knowable duties. The *Open Court* is a weekly paper established to teach and to illustrate this Scientific Religion and Philosophy, and to reconcile all other religions by including them in it. Its establishment, without regard to cost or consequences, is one of the great events in the history of American thought. It is a new view of the world and of life and duty which reconciles science and religion freed from superstition, and makes them ONE with a saving power,—the idea of duty and devotion to MAN as the flower of an Infinite World.

What is needed in this and every civilized country is this motive which will compel a higher life. This new monistic human faith signified its power in the sublime enthusiasm which made its first martyr, Bruno, face the most cruel of deaths as a triumph rather than to pretend to recant. What a splendid Republic we should have if a touch of that sublime heroism of duty and patriotism should reach the masses of our people? Dr. Carus describes, under a great variety of topics, the issues and the solutions presented by this new view of Philosophy and gives the practical outcome in the Preface to his book, thus;

“We know of no decline of any nation on earth, unless it was preceded by an intellectual and moral rottenness, which took the

shape of some negative creed or skepticism, teaching the maxim that man lives *for the pleasure* of living, and that the purpose of our life is MERELY *to enjoy ourselves*."

All philosophic, moral and practical questions are therefore treated in this book as parts of the infinite world and its *infinite duty*, "equally remote from asceticism or hedonism." Such a book, with the *Open Court* back of it, is a new and a beneficent revelation and power in our land, with which it becomes every person of free thought and a good heart to become personally acquainted as soon as possible. It is an improvement upon the forms of Positivism heretofore presented in America, for it is *real* instead of *phenomenal*, *infinite* instead of *dual* and finite; and teaches the duty whereunto the World and Manhood is calling us, instead of leaving us to wallow in the sensual or æsthetic hedonism of individual indulgence, without regard to the World or Society of which we are parts.

This seems to be an advanced scientific view of the Positive Philosophy, Religion and Duty. Monism as a philosophy cannot but be enduring, for it is founded on the *Infinite* and ends by flowing out into the health, good and glory of *Man* individual and collective. These are the tests of our age of Liberty, Science and Humanity. The philosophies and religions which, in their present forms, cannot stand these tests, must gradually submit to modifications, so as to become reconciled to the scientific or monistic view of the world, and the sooner that is done the better will it be for all.

HOW TO BE GOOD THOUGH GODLESS.*

BY HUGH O. PENTECOST.

I AM now going to have a plain, familiar talk with you about the reason why we who have no belief in a God do things that we believe are right. It is commonly supposed that if we lose faith in that purely hypothetical person called God and in equally hypothetical personal immortality, that we will have no moral motive power left and will be likely to go to the bad. You know that in Christian circles it is honestly believed that Infidels are almost necessarily bad people. I, myself, often get

* A lecture delivered Sunday September 15, 1889, before Mr. Pentecost's audience.

letters from Christians, evidently written in much earnestness and sincerity, who believe that I am leading young men and women to their ruin; who think that it is a calamity that such persons as I should be allowed to talk and write to the people.

I know just how these persons feel, because I once felt that way myself. I used to think that if one would not accept Jesus as a savior, according to the well-known theological plan of salvation, it was because the human heart is naturally bad, the carnal mind is enmity against God, and also because the particular person in question was rebellious against God or bent upon the pleasures of this world. And if these unbelievers happened to be upright persons with fine, strong characters, as some of them were, I thought their goodness was of a different quality from the Christian's goodness; I thought the goodness was "mere morality," that would not avail to save them if they had not been washed with the blood of Jesus Christ, which, the Bible says, cleanseth believers from all sins.

As I say, it is commonly believed that Infidels are bad people. Now, some of you are Infidels and so am I, and so, it follows that many of our friends who knew us, perhaps, when we were Christians think that we have "fallen from grace," that we have suffered moral degeneration by becoming Infidels. But (I know not how it is with you), in my case, I am a much better man than I was when I was a Christian. I have a more serious and earnest mind, a greater desire to do right, a greater abhorrence of doing wrong; I neither love this world nor fear to die as much as I did then. Of course, these words will be picked up, and, upon the strength of them, it will be said that I am conceited and self-righteous. But that is of no consequence. It is necessary in order to get out my thoughts to-day that I should talk a little about myself, and I will not be hypocritical enough to say that I think I am a bad man when I know that I am not. It is necessary to my purpose now to say that my present manner of thought has made me a better man than I was when I was a Christian, and you are at liberty to inquire among all the people who know me to find out whether there are any stains upon my character or not.

Now, how does this come about? How does it happen that Infidelity makes at least one man better than Christianity? That is what I am going to try to tell you, in the few words to which I must necessarily confine myself in this address.

I think the secret of it all lies in that I ceased to be a Christian through hunting for what is true; and this is what I am doing yet—hunting for what is true. I think one cannot very long search for the truth upon any subject without finding it. And when you find it, it becomes a great inspirer and purifier. The average Christian does not hunt for the truth; he searches the Scriptures and accepts what they teach without investigation; he reads the creed; he conforms himself to the traditions and authoritative declarations of the Church. It is not necessary that he should develop what he calls his conscience, because the Bible is, in his estimation, above conscience. I have heard an eloquent minister say that Christians should constantly regulate their consciences by the Bible just as we regulate our watches by the electric time-ball.

It is not logically necessary that a Christian should go scrupulously right every time, because pardon for sins is part of his doctrine. Character is nothing like so important in the Church as salvation. It is better, according to Christian orthodox theology, logically carried out, to be "saved" with the blood of a neighbor upon your hands or the price of a slave in your pocket than to be "lost" with a spotless character. I know, of course, that some of the best people on this earth are Christians—better, probably, than any of you; better, certainly, than I. But they are not logical. They are superlatively good *in spite* of their doctrines; and, too, a very good Christian is generally more or less heretical.

On the other hand, an unbeliever has to work out his own salvation with more or less fear and trembling—not because of future torments, but because of the possible loss of his own self-respect and the deterioration of his character. There is no one to help him but himself, and there is no one to suffer in his stead. He has no God and no Devil; no heaven and no hell; no authoritative dogma and no savior.

This seems to a Christian like a very awful kind of life for anyone to lead. It is, to him, a blasphemous, sacrilegious kind of life to lead. But that is where the Christian is mistaken. It is a very true and lofty kind of life.

Most people think that there must be some sort of faith in God and the future life in order to make this life sacred. And yet, if you will only stop to think of it, you will remember that

nearly all the beastly drunkards, the burglars, the libertines, the prostitutes and the murderers are believers in God, and many of them are members of the Church. Well, that ought to show that religion does not *necessarily* make life sweet and clean. There are multitudes of sweet and clean people who *are* religious. But their religion does not make them so. They would be so anyhow.

Why, only a little while ago the editor of a Newark Sunday paper told his readers that I was in a deplorable state because I did not believe in God. He said he knew I was not stupid, but that there must be something the matter with my mental gearing, and he ended his pious editorial by saying: "God pity him!" There is no knowing whether an editor thinks what he writes or not. The average editor will write almost anything for pay. But I happen to know this man, and he actually is a believer in God, but his life is no better than many of his neighbors who do not believe in God.

Countless instances might be cited to show you that a religious belief does not make nor tend to make people good—that is, noble, generous, unselfish, honest and morally clean. Many a religious colored person down South will go from prayer-meeting to a water-melon patch on felonious deeds intent. Many a Roman Catholic politician will pay for a mass out of the money that he got for doing corrupt things. Many a Protestant churchman will speculate in land, or rob his workmen, or go where he wouldn't like his wife to follow him. The men who murdered Dr. Cronin were too religious to touch the sacred charm he wore about his neck. I do not say that an *absence* of religious belief is any more calculated to make men good. But I do say that an earnest determination to know and do the truth will tend to make you good whether you are religious or not.

Now, let me explain to you as best I can my moral motive power, for, as I have already said, I do not know anything about the inner workings of anyone's else life. I must speak from my own experience if I speak at all.

I do not believe in God. I do not believe there is any God. Neither do I believe there is no God. This is simply because I can have no beliefs upon a subject about which I know nothing and, for the present, can know nothing, and about which no one else knows anything in a manner that enables him to explain what he knows to others.

I think the word God will, in time, go out of serious use just as the words centaur and fairy and phoenix have gone out of serious use, and for the same reason, viz.: because there is nothing in the universe that corresponds to it. Drive the believer in God into a corner and try to force him to tell you one thing that he knows about God, and he cannot do it. But he hangs on to his belief and his word of three letters just as the believer in Jupiter or in witches did until all men came to understand that there are no such beings.

But this non-belief in God is not meant by me to be blasphemous or wicked, and it does not give me a tendency to be bad. It arises from the fact that I wish to be truthful. I actually do not know anything of God. But what of it? Is that any reason why I should defraud my neighbor or beat my wife or live only for the gratification of my present desires? What has a belief in God to do with these things?

Do you say that I should not do these things because God will punish me if I do? I answer that that is no reason at all why I should not do evil. In the first place, only a bad man fears punishment, and in the second place, to punish anybody is precisely what this hypothetical person that you call God never does. There are plenty of frauds abroad—political frauds, commercial frauds and religious frauds—men who lie and steal by every known legal method. But God does not punish them. On the contrary, they are the very people who run God's Church and God's State, and who teach people to believe that Infidels are wicked. If you think that God punishes people, why do you use whipping-posts and prisons and gibbets to punish them yourselves?

Ah, but you say, God punishes mostly in the next world. I answer: that is something you know nothing about, and I, at least, care nothing about. It is enough for me to know that if I do anything that injures myself or my neighbor I make myself unhappy by bringing upon myself perfectly natural evil consequences.

My daily experience is that when two courses of conduct are up before me I know that if I choose one of them I shall suffer loss of self-respect, I shall suffer what we call remorse; but that if I choose the other I shall be at peace with myself, even though I lose money and friends. Money is desirable and friends are

delightful. But it is better to have neither than to suffer remorse, than to feel: "I chose the course that is hurtful to my fellow or to myself."

Now, what has God or heaven or hell to do with this? Absolutely nothing. There is that knowledge that this course injures others or myself, and will throw me out of peace with myself and therefore must be avoided. Why I am dissatisfied with myself if I injure my neighbor I do not know. But I know that it is so, and my religious beliefs or non-beliefs have nothing to do with the case. I am simply seeking my own *highest* happiness, and this I will naturally do without reference to God or immortality.

Let me illustrate what I mean from personal experience. I was once in the Church. I suppose by being careful and politic, never displeasing the influential people in the Church, keeping my doubts to myself and preaching *to* the rich and *at* the poor I could have lived very well in the Church. There are ministers doing quite well who have no more brains, nor eloquence nor engaging manners than I have. But instead of all that I was never careful and politic—I declared my doubts and I preached *to* the poor and *at* the rich. The result was that by the time the Church was ready to put me out I was ready to go out.

Many Christian people, of course, believe that I am possessed by the Devil, but, on the other hand, many persons praise me for sticking to my convictions. But as a matter of fact I did nothing praiseworthy. I saw that if I stifled my convictions to save my salary and position I should be more unhappy than if I went out and faced poverty and the odium of the Scribes and Pharisees. I knew that in the long run I would rather look at myself in shabby clothing than to look at myself with a ragged and dirty moral nature. And I simply chose that path which would yield me the most moral happiness. There is nothing praiseworthy in that. It is selfishness.

A person with a highly-developed moral nature *must* be a martyr in this world so long as we are governed by thieves, priests, politicians, policemen and soldiers, and it is simply a question of whether he will suffer poverty and loneliness or the loss of self-respect through the consciousness of moral decay. Some persons choose one kind of martyrdom and some the other. For my part I would rather conduct myself so that other people will be ashamed of me than to be ashamed of myself. It is a

matter of no moment to me to be called a crank or to go without shoes or potatoes so long as I know I am saying and doing that which is best for others and for myself; that is, so long as I am saying and doing that which is right.

Now, what has a belief in God or the hope of immortality to do with all that? Absolutely nothing. I don't know where this universe came from or is going to. Your life and mine are equal mysteries to me. I don't understand how we can live after death, and if we are not to live, consciously, after death, I don't see any particular reason why we should be living now. I don't see how this world can go on forever just as it is now, capable of sustaining human life, and yet if, some day, it is to cool off, like the moon, into a dead cinder, I don't see any sense of its being here at all. I don't see how there can be any God, and yet I don't see how things can be what they are unless there is power, purpose and will somewhere, and immeasurably greater than man's. In short, beyond the simple facts of the movements of nature and the daily experiences of man I know nothing, and neither do you, and neither does the pope, nor the cardinals, nor the presbytery, nor the synod, nor the council.

But what of it? That does not alter the fact that if you do what injures others or yourself you wreck your own moral happiness, and if you do what is for the good of others and yourself you build up your own moral happiness. You certainly can *know* nothing of God and the hereafter, and it is a matter of no consequence what you *believe* about them. Whatever you believe will not alter the facts. All that is needful is that you should do right, simply because it *is* right, as you may say if you believe in the abstract right; but I am more and more inclined to say do right because in that way alone can you be at peace with yourself.

Some of you are afraid to do right because it is so expensive—you will lose your business or be looked down upon; but I assure you your happiness will repay you for every loss. I am growing poorer every month. It is as certain as anything can be that my last days will be spent in poverty. If I look into the future I can see much trouble that apparently awaits me. But each month is happier than the last, because to try to be truthful and do that which is right is the highway of peace.

I know that each of you has his daily struggle. You want to

do right but the love of money or the fear of men in some cases tempts you to do wrong. You cannot be happy in that way of living. If you want happiness you must be willing to lose all for the sake of gaining it. You cannot be morally happy if you tell or act lies, if you in any way defraud your neighbor, if you do things that you have to conceal. But real happiness is worth all it costs. Peace of mind is worth more than money or friends. It is worth all it can possibly cost you. It is a pearl of great price for which we should be willing to give all else that we possess, if necessary.—*Twentieth Century*.

WHY WAS BRUNO MURDERED?

BY GEORGE JACOB HOLYOAKE.

IN the paper published in the September number of this Magazine characteristics of the murder of Bruno were described. But *why* he was murdered is not a less instructive inquiry.

In the old days, when theologians had eyes, when science began to make its first mark, and to announce its first systematic discoveries; the priests saw that a new power had arisen and was standing by their side, which they could not move, and which was overshadowing them. Then they said, partly in their ignorance and partly in their fear: "Science will destroy religion." What they might have said (if they had known better) was that science would change religion, and give men mightier views and a firmer standing-ground than tradition and obsolete revelations afforded them. Superior to dogmatic religion is the sense of awe at the infinite universe outside us—reverence inspired by the perception of that silent, unheeding, unresting force which has ordered all things before us, and which stretches beyond us evermore. When Bruno first announced that there was a plurality of worlds, and, instead of this planet being the sole creation of the Mosaic God, there were millions and millions of similar and greater worlds in infinite space, possibly inhabited by nobler beings than man; all equally under the care and guardianship of one stupendous power, theologians were blinded with the flood of new light, and stood for awhile dumb with consternation. They could see how the childish inventions and ignorant explanations of Hebrew theology—how its pitiful contrivances and fanciful schemes of atonement; its anthropomorphic ideas of God, wandering amid the woods of Eden in search of Adam; or ex-

plaining things to Cain, when his "countenance fell" because the smoke of his sacrifice did not ascend according to his mind; or arranging the crucifixion of a poor, gentle-souled, visionary Jew, as late as two thousand years ago, as a scheme of salvation for those of the human race who might happen to hear of it—priests could see how Bible fictions faded into infinite pettiness.

The God of the old Jews was a mere attorney in large practice, who had undertaken to collect the rents and debts of the little half-drowned universe Moses knew. We blame them not, but beg leave to follow them not. They had no conception of the magnificent Omnipotence which science has revealed, whose illimitable grandeur is as much beyond our finite powers to appraise as the terms in which men speak of this Jew Deity are poor and beggarly, compared with those required to express the attribute of infinite loftiness and perspicacity which science reveals in Nature.

When astronomers first explained to theologians that this world was not a vast flat surface on which mankind walked to and fro, fixed and firm on some solid base which could never move; but that it was a vast, ponderable, black ball, darting in the darkness on its awful journey through space, lighted only by precarious and distant solar rays, science was regarded as a thing of horror, whose dreadful revelations struck men as though a demon had spoken; and common men, not priests alone, were ready to kill the astronomer; as the poor Brahmin at a later date was ready to destroy the satanic microscope which revealed to him life in the water and in vegetable, which he thought pure and unliving. The Brahmin destroyed the microscope because he thought it created the horrors which it revealed; and in the same manner the uninformed priest imagined that science made the awful mysteries it disclosed. Hence he treated discoveries as criminal inventions. Now men have grown calmer and wiser. They understand that science is the purifier of piety, the enlarger of devotion, and imparts a new sublimity to reverence which no Bible, no tradition, no theology, was ever able to give to it. There is nothing so religious as science, as men will one day know, if the term religion is to be retained under a wholesome acceptation. If God made Nature, Bruno did more to reveal His stupendousness and glory than all the Popes. Making Nature great made Jewish theology little, and orthodox churches teachers of small things. Therefore the priests burnt Bruno.

THE MYTH OF THE GREAT DELUGE.

BY JAMES M. McCANN.

(Continued.)

V I.

"In the course of conversations with the Mohammedan Arabs or Eastern Christians on the dimensions of the ark, I have frequently read to them the account given in the Bible, but was always vehemently opposed, as they asserted that in my book there must be some mistake in the translation, and that some larger measure should be substituted for cubits; a remark which, if the ordinary idea of a universal deluge be accepted, is certainly not unreasonable."—*Pierott*.

According to the calculations of Sir Isaac Newton the ark was 515.62 feet long, 85.94 wide and 51.56 deep. The measured tonnage was 18,232. The Great Eastern is 780 feet long, 83 feet wide and 53 feet deep, and she measures 28,093 tons. If the ark had only one small window and one door, and was covered inside and out with pitch, it must have been perfectly dark and utterly without ventilation. Noah was commanded to take on board 4 elephants, 4 hippopotami, 18 rhinoceroses, 12 camels, 14 giraffes, 16 horses, 2,086 bovine animals, 728 deer, 44 swine, 30 bears, 132 lions, tigers, leopards, etc., 108 dogs, wolves and foxes, 438 apes and monkeys, 112 kangaroos, 50 crocodiles, 184 gluttons, weasels, skunks, etc., 12 tapirs, 54 porcupines, 80 hares and rabbits, 200 civets, genets, etc., 44 opossums, 24 sloths, 30 ant-eaters, 34 armadillos, 400 squirrels, 660 rats and mice, 890 bats, 2,520 owls, 2,660 crows, 4,280 woodpeckers, 476 birds-of-paradise, 2,660 honey-suckers, 4,970 doves and pigeons, 2,550 hawks and kites, 9,954 shrikes, 1,540 larks, 3,528 weaver finches, 5,404 parrots, 5,600 gallinaceous birds, 4,256 tanagers, 2,520 cuckoos, 6,126 finches, 6,230 thrushes, 3,038 American creepers, 1,728 sun-birds, 1,750 kingfishers, 2,520 ducks, geese and swans, 1,946 bulbuls, 3,962 fly-catchers, 8,960 warblers, 8,400 humming-birds, 2,232 lizards, 1,794 snakes, 114 toads, 103 tree-frogs, 2,510 moths, 20,000 butterflies,* 1,400,000 beetles,† 4,000 snails and a vast

* There are probably at least ten thousand species now living.—*cudder's Butterflies*, page 226.

† There are more than 100,000 described species of beetles in the museums of the world, and as it was a clean animal fourteen of each species must have been admitted into the ark.

array of tortoises, land shells, worms,* spiders and other animals. Noah must have packed into the ark more than 6,000 mammals, 4,000 reptiles, 112,000 birds, and at least 500,000 species of insects,† and unless the *parasites*‡ of every animal within the ark had been miraculously destroyed, their numbers would have vastly exceeded the single pair of every species of such creatures permitted to survive. There are more than thirty species which prey upon man alone, and no animal whatever is without both external and internal parasites. "There is no organ which is sheltered from their invasions: neither the brain, the ear, the eye, the heart, the blood, the lungs, the spinal marrow, the nerves, the muscles or even the bones. The very animals which live as parasites, harbor others in their turn. We find parasites on parasites."§ In the far North, under the many-colored lights of the Aurora, is sometimes seen snow red as blood, or green as emerald. This is due to minute forests of vegetable forms and thirty-seven species have been already enumerated as belonging to the flora of the Arctic snows; and this flora is associated with a fauna equally minute. How could Noah have preserved in the heated ark these microscopic animals that can live only in the frozen snows of the North? "Every particle of matter is to be conceived of as a garden full of plants, or a pond full of fishes; but every twig of each plant, every limb of each animal, every drop in its humors, is again such a garden, or such a pond, full of decreasingly minute lives, similar in kind."||

Now, in addition to this living cargo, Noah must have found room for food enough to supply the wants of his family, and all the animals within the ark for one year and seventeen days. His cargo must have been more than doubled, both in bulk and in weight. Millions of living animals must have been taken on board to serve as food for carnivorous mammals, reptiles, birds

* There are worms in Ceylon five feet long, an inch thick and of a fine sky-blue color.—*Haeckel's Ceylon*, page 296.

† *The Geographical Distribution of Animals*, by Alfred Russell Wallace, is the main authority used in this essay, as to the number of species. Since the publication of this great work many new forms have been discovered, belonging to no known species, and much of the earth's surface is still unexplored.

‡ Every insect has more than one parasite.—*Prof. P. Martin Duncan*.

§ *Van Benden's Animal Parasites and Mesmates*, pages 91, 92.

|| *Papillon's Nature and Life*, page 41.

and insects.* The food for a single lion is twenty-five pounds of fresh meat a day; he would consume 9,550 pounds during the 382 days that he remained a prisoner in the ark. An elephant will eat 400 pounds of hay each day; and the four within the ark would have required more than 600,000 pounds. The ark was not large enough to have contained the necessary food alone! The interior of the ark must have been divided and subdivided into millions of compartments, in order that the carnivorous animals might have been separated from their herbivorous neighbors—the lamb and gazelle must have been protected from the fang of wolf and claw of tiger. The rattlesnake and cobra could not have been permitted to crawl at will over the floor of the ark, or they would surely have been crushed beneath the feet of other captives, and would have inflicted deadly injuries in return. Birds of prey must all have been carefully caged, or they would have fed on doves and birds-of-paradise. Carnivorous insects must have been separated from each other, and from the flower-lovers, and passage-ways left for the use of Noah and his family while giving the animals food and drink,† and removing the ever accumulating filth from this worse than Augean stable. These millions of necessary compartments would, of course, have greatly diminished the space available for the living cargo, and would have rendered any ventilation whatever impossible; so that no animal known to us could have breathed the noxious vapors of the ark for a single hour and lived. The ark was by no means the largest vessel ever afloat—"ships of the same proportions have been built, notably in Holland, and possessed a great carrying capacity,"‡ but did ever ship put to sea with such a tonnage?

Admitting that it had stowage room for such a cargo—and it most certainly had not—would it not have gone, with all its living freight, to the bottom like a stone?

* Prof. Duncan says that the dragon-fly is the most blood-thirsty of living animals; and as there are 1,700 species, Noah must, therefore, have had the care of 3,400 of these sanguinary insects.

† The rain-water of the deluge when mingled with the waters of every sea and ocean would have contained salt; and as the decomposing bodies of the human race, together with all the great land animals of the whole earth, would have been floating in this universal sea, it could not have been fit for any animal to drink.

‡ *Bussell's Legends and Superstitions of the Sea*, page 483.

VII.

"The earth is divided into separate zoological provinces, each with its own peculiar animal and vegetable world. The kangaroo, for instance, is found in Australia and there only. By no possibility could the aboriginal kangaroo have jumped at one bound from Mount Ararat to Australia, leaving no trace of his passage in any intermediate district."—*Laing*.

We are nowhere told that divine agency was any way employed in collecting together the animals of the earth. The Lord commanded Noah to bring them into the ark. Now we know that he could not have brought these animals home with him, even if he had explored every mountain-slope and valley, and discovered every cape and island on the earth from pole to pole. Neither would his scientific attainments have enabled him to classify or distinguish the different species even had the entire animal world been assembled around him. The male and female of many species of birds are of different colors and quite unlike each other—the one brilliant in crimson or orange, the other dressed in sombre gray; in many species of insects they have not the slightest resemblance whatever.

"Not only do single islands, however small, often possess peculiar species of land shells, but sometimes single mountains or valleys, or even a particular mountain-side, possess species or varieties found nowhere else upon the globe."* A small islet called Round Island, only about a mile across, and situated about fourteen miles northeast of Mauritius, possesses a snake which is unknown in any other part of the world, being altogether confined to this minute islet.† "The Bornean yellow bulbul (*Otocampus montis*) has only been met with on the peak of Kina-Balu, and the red bird-of-paradise (*Paradisca rubra*) only within the narrow limits of the island of Waigiou."‡

"The great volcanic peaks of Chimborazo and Pichincha have each a peculiar species of humming-bird confined to a belt just below the limits of perpetual snow, while the extinct volcano of Chiniqui in Veragua has a species confined to its wooded crater."§ Can we believe that this snake was lifted by the hand of God from the ocean island, and the humming-bird from the mountain

* *Wallace's Island Life*, page 74.

† *Wallace's Island Life*, page 402.

‡ *Hilprin's Geographical and Geological Distribution of Animals*, page 17.

§ *Wallace's Island Life*, pages 15, 16.

crater, transported through the air for thousands of miles, caged and cared for in the ark for more than a year, and then returned in safety to their former homes?

"New Zealand, an island as large as Great Britain, has only a single living indigenous mammal—a rat of doubtful origin."* Were a pair of these rodents carried safely over seas and oceans by the Creator of ten thousand million suns, handed over to Noah to feed and protect from the waste of waters, and then carried back again over the Southern seas?

But we are nowhere informed that any supernatural means were employed in returning the animals again to the lands from which they were taken. The plain inference is that they were left to make their own way back again as best they could. How did our own tortoise accomplish such a journey? When would our garden snail have gotten here?

If all living animals have dispersed themselves over the earth from Armenian mountains within the last 5,000 years, how does it happen that the humming-bird is found on the American continent alone? How did the 1,794 land snakes when turned out of the ark cross snow-fields and glaciers and spread themselves over the earth? Why is it that no crows exist in South America while they are found in every other part of the world? If the snail has reached Patagonia, might not the crow have arrived by this time on the Orinoco? If the mole is already in our flower-gardens, why has it never set its foot upon the soil of Africa? †

"The moas of New Zealand have only recently become extinct, a specimen mounted in the British Museum being eleven feet high."‡ "There is reason to believe that the *æpyornis*, a gigantic bird, lived in the island of Madagascar less than 200 years ago."§ "The great Irish elk, a huge antlered deer, probably existed almost down to historic times."

* *Grant Allen's Life of Darwin*, page 54.

† It has already been remarked that the interposition of extensive and elevated mountain-chains and large bodies of water, and also sudden changes in the physical character of a country, are insurmountable obstacles in the way of migration or dispersion of certain classes of animals.—*Heilprin's Geographical and Geological Distribution of Animals*, page 41.

‡ *Wallace's Geographical Distribution of Animals*, volume 1, page 164.

§ *Ibid.*, volume 1, page 164.

¶ *Ibid.*, volume 1, page 110. As the Irish elk—an animal as large as a horse—was *clean*, there must therefore have been fourteen of them taken into the ark.

Were these gigantic animals preserved in the ark from the waters of the deluge only to perish miserably before they were even seen by enlightened men? Not thus has nature wrought!

Principal Dawson says "it is now an established conclusion that the great aggressive faunas and floras of the continents have originated in the North, some of them within the Arctic Circle." "All the evidence at our command points to the Northern hemisphere as the birthplace of the class mammalia, and probably of all the orders."*

Instead of setting out on their travels from Armenian mountains, less than 5,000 years ago, the animal and floral worlds came down from the North long before man had appeared upon the earth; colonized Europe and America while they were still united; entered Africa on dry land before the Atlantic had burst through the Pillars of Hercules; spread themselves over Asia and into the islands of the Pacific before they had been separated from the great continents of the North; higher forms being continually evolved from lower ones—bird from reptile and man from ape—imperfect creatures transformed by the magic touch of Selection and Time into higher and nobler ones, but never all swept away, at any time, by the waters of a deluge!

"It is certain that no universal deluge ever took place since man existed, and that the animal life existing in the world, and shown by fossil remains to have existed for untold ages, could by no possibility have originated from pairs of animals living together in the ark, and radiating from a mountain in Armenia."†

(To be concluded.)

PUBLISHER'S NOTE.

"The Myth of the Great Deluge" will be concluded in the December Magazine and will be immediately published in beautiful pamphlet form, the same style as the "Bruno Pamphlet," and the price will be the same—fifteen cents for a single number, ten numbers to one address for one dollar. This is one of the most valuable articles that we have ever published and the pamphlet should have a large circulation. We request those who desire copies to order them at once.—*Publisher.*

* *Wallace's Geographical Distribution of Animals*, volume 11, page 544.

† *Modern Science and Modern Thought*, pages 251, 252.

LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

GIORDANO BRUNO.

BY EMMA ROOD TUTTLE.

“**P**OSTHUMOUS Justice ! ” We have lived to see
How unforgetting thou canst sometimes be ;
How strangely patient thou canst Wrong confront
And bring thy worthy heroes to the front,
Wrenching their names from time-beclouding fate
To share the glory of the truly great.

Rome had a dark transaction years ago
(Almost three hundred—less ten years, or so),
When in her Field of Flowers, by orders dire,
Great Giordano Bruno died by fire ;
The “ Holy Inquisition ” did decree,
For heresy, he burned alive should be.

What heresies ? *The infinity of space ;*
More worlds than this, which is our dwelling-place ;
The earth's rotation, to its orbit true.
These were his heresies—old truths to you !
His rankest heresy was nothing worse
Than this : “ *Our earth is not the universe !* ”

Christians ! in cool, premeditating mood
You murdered one who longed to do you good !
Creed-mad tormentors ! Though you tore his tongue
With pincers, still to spotless Truth he clung.
Clad in her valor when he went to die,
He met his fate without a moan or cry.

You dreamed that fire and death had ended all ;
That Bruno slept beneath oblivion's pall.
You even dared his cruel fate deny,
And crown your hatred with a coward lie
As dark years veiled it. But, alack, in vain !
The ages have writ out the record plain !

Shout ! Rome held festival this year, in June,
When flowers were bountiful and birds in tune.
The nineteenth century awoke at last
To honor Bruno, martyr of the past.
In Campo de Fiori, where he burned,
Lo ! a grand monument his greatness earned !

Builded by men of thought, of many lands,
 A fine rebuke to bigotry it stands ;
 His noble likeness towering grand and high,
 With eyes uplifted toward the infinite sky,
 A silent preacher, standing there to say
 How surely wrong and darkness flee away.

And Rome was full of souls athrob with light,
 Full thirty thousand, rapturous with delight ;
 One hundred bands of music centered there,
 And nineteen hundred banners kissed the air ;
 Italy's king among the throng appeared,
 Saw Bruno's monument, admired and cheered.

O grand and righteous triumph ! come at last !
 The age and wisdom Bruno's mind forecast
 Are with us ! But the Pope—ah ! where was he ?
 Locked in his palace's grim security !
 And not a priest was seen that day in Rome ;
 Shame-hidden they bemoaned such day had come !

BERLIN HEIGHTS, OHIO, Sept., E. M., 289.

THE FOLLOWERS OF THE MEEK AND LOWLY ONE.

WE read in "God's Word" of a certain rich man who was clothed in purple and fine linen and fared sumptuously every day, and also of a certain beggar who was full of sores, and that after they had both died and were buried, the rich man, who had fared sumptuously every day, turned up in hell, and the poor beggar with the sores was carefully conveyed by angels to a snug, cozy little retreat in Abraham's bosom. And in hell the rich man observed the poor fellow "afar off" in his comfortable quarters, and, after calling for a little water to cool his tongue, inquired of Abraham how it came about that the beggar was so much better cared for than he was. And Abraham replied : "Remember that thou in thy life-time received the good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things ; but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented" (St. Luke xvi : 25). Now, if this rule of leveling up things in the next world has not been changed, what must be the prospect for the clergy in these days, who are *especially the men* who are "*clothed in purple and fine linen, and fare sumptuously every day*" ? It would seem that according to this biblical doctrine the clergy are going in the opposite direction from "Abraham's bosom." As evidence of how these "followers of the meek and lowly Jesus" live, we quote the following from the New York *World* of a recent date :

A preacher comes as near having his "pathway strewn with roses" as any mortal here below. Even if he is a country preacher, journeying from church to church, the people vie with each other for the honor of entertaining him. He is given the best "spare room," always so painfully clean that he feels tempted to take his boots off at the door, and would rather sleep under the bed

than muss its plump and perfect outlines (?), and he is fed on chicken and trimmings till his very soul yearns for corned beef and cabbage. If he is a city preacher—ah, well, we can't all be city preachers; so the pleasures of such a life had better not be enumerated. One thing he does have, though, that very few other men get unless they are born with the proverbial silver spoon in their mouths, that is, two whole months' vacation every summer, with pay. There is no class of men who get more enjoyment out of life than they do, and statistics and observations prove that they are the longest lived.

There is a prevailing notion among the people who never get much nearer a minister than one of the rear pews of his church on a religious holiday (unless they die or marry), that when he takes his vacation it is to withdraw from the public gaze for serious meditation, prayer and study, or that he is browsing on piety in new fields, and they associate him with vague and undefined visions of pilgrims with tacks in their shoes and scratchy undershirts, enthusiastically footing it to Jerusalem.

The truth is that ministers spend their vacations in the most sensible (?) matter-of-fact and every-day manner, with all the enjoyment and rest and recreation possible.

And then they expect to have the front seats, the finest harps and the most glittering crowns in the Kingdom of Heaven, because *they have done so much* for "The Lord Jesus Christ." What a "cross" these poor fellows have to bear!—EDITOR.

WHAT THE GOOD FRIENDS SAY.

Hiram Austin, Connellsville, Pa.:

I think all lovers of Liberty, let them be Agnostics, Spiritualists, Materialists, or any other class of Liberalists, can consistently unite in support of the principles advocated in your Magazine. It would be a burning shame if Liberals should allow it to fail for want of financial support. I hope to do more for it in the future than I have in the past.

Wm. C. Smith, South Corinth, N. Y.:

Inclosed you will find P. O. order for \$3.00, for which please send me ten copies of the "Bruno Pamphlet" and the FREETHINKERS' MAGAZINE for one year. I have been a subscriber of the *Investigator* for several years, but, like J. S. Mill, am one of the few who have never changed their views relative to the popular delusions, mysticisms and superstitions, which, through priestly domination, avarice and craftiness, has in all ages retarded the advancement, elevation and progress of the human race.

L. R. Titus, San Jose, California:

To say that we all like your handsome and instructive Magazine does not fully express it. The only wonder is that everybody who sees it don't come down with two dollars for a year's subscription. It is boiling over with Reason and Science and good Sense; it is just the book for every priest, preacher and church advocate to have in his library. I inclose \$5.00—two for next year's subscription, one on the sustaining fund, and two for "Bruno Pamphlets," and my only regret is that I can't make it a thousand dollars. But I am *sure* to come again. [Talk about Dr. Brown-Sequard's elixir as a restorer to health and a renewer of age—such a letter as the above knocks it out in the first round! We felt ten years younger in five minutes after reading it.—EDITOR.]

W. B. Clark, Worcester, Mass. :

I send five dollars in aid of the Magazine and will contribute that sum annually until further notice. I like the Magazine very much and I am very glad to give something to help spread abroad such information as the FREETHINKERS' MAGAZINE contains. You are having a hard fight with superstition and I am glad that your prospects are brighter for the future. I love the principles of Freethought and do what I can to make and muster in converts.

William E. Warner, Scranton, Pa. :

For the inclosed five dollars you may send the Magazine to each of the following names for six months. They are all good common-sense men, and I do not see how they can do without it. I anxiously look for it every month. [Mr. Warner is a young man, just setting out on the journey of life, highly respected by all who know him, and his liberality is well exemplified in the above short note in which he contributes the Magazine to five sensible men for six months each. He has set a good example for older men to follow.—EDITOR.]

Geo. Langford, Philadelphia, Pa. :

I am pleased to say I have disposed of all my "Bruno Pamphlets," and inclosed find money for another supply. I hope you are selling them by the one thousand. The October number of the FREETHINKERS' MAGAZINE is just splendid. I hope you will have many orders for it, containing as it does the fine oration of Col. Ingersoll at Horace Seaver's funeral and other able obituary notices. Every Liberal ought to procure a copy for preservation. [We are glad to say the "Bruno Pamphlet" is having a very large sale, but not near as large as it deserves.—EDITOR.]

J. P. Williams, Sunderland, Vt. :

I will secure as many thirty-cent contributions from the one-dollar club subscribers here as I can, and try and procure a large list for next year. I think the Magazine worthy of the most liberal support, and am sure I voice the sentiments of all its readers in this vicinity when I say it is *the* best of the Liberal publications and ought to be read by every orthodox person in the land. Now, as I am selling some of my goods—"Turned Wood Spoons"—in your city, if you will secure an order of twenty-five dollars worth from some dealer, I will become one of the "One Hundred" stock subscribers. [Now where is the man who will take the \$25 worth of these goods?—EDITOR.]

Geo. W. Watson, Washington, D. C. :

Thanks for the five copies of the FREETHINKERS' MAGAZINE sent, from the reading of which I have derived much satisfaction. Referring to the proposition in the June number for friends of the publication to pledge themselves to contribute five dollars annually for five years, I am unwilling to so pledge, but herewith inclose the amount (\$5.00) for prepayment of a year's subscription, and shall probably continue to do this yearly for the time mentioned, if circumstances will favor my doing so, of which I alone constitute myself the judge. Will you please send me a copy of "Church and State" for the postage stamps, also herewith inclosed? [We will put Mr. Watson's name in the "One Hundred" list in accordance with the terms of this statement.—EDITOR.]

S. Knodle, Mt. Morris, Ill.:

Bro. John Wolf, who has entered the list of the "One Hundred," has requested me to send you the inclosed P. O. order for \$5.00, which you will please duly acknowledge. I am greatly pleased with the Magazine, but just now a dollar with me is as large as a coach-wheel. In other words, I am not able to make the two ends meet, and am compelled to forego many things that would give me pleasure and comfort in my old age. I lack a little of being as old as Brother Seaver was, but expect before long "to pass in my checks." The great mortification from which I suffer is my inability to do so little for the cause of Freethought. [We very gladly place Brother Knodle on our free list, and hope other Liberal journals will do the same. Suppose we appoint him a Missionary to scatter Freethought literature in his neighborhood?—EDITOR.]

Wm. P. Lippincott, Vernon, Iowa:

Inclosed find a draft for one dollar, for which please send me ten "Bruno Pamphlets." How is it that we are so afraid of Roman Catholic control in this country, while in Italy the great mass of the people are ignorant Catholics, and yet are controlled by an enlightened government? I don't understand it. The Christianity of to-day makes people so hypocritical that they are hard to understand. Is there something that some people call fate managing this business? Louis Bonaparte probably had some kind of common sense, and yet he was a hypocrite, for we must suppose that he had sense enough to know there was no foundation in truth for this religion, and yet this man kept an army of Swiss soldiers at Rome to protect the pope. And then to show his imbecile sagacity he picked a quarrel with Germany and got whipped. The Swiss were withdrawn to help him in his unjust war, and out of all this rascality what has been the result? Why, Rome belongs to Italy; the Freethinkers of the world have a statue of Bruno in Rome, and free Italy protects it.

N. U. Lyon, Fall River, Mass.:

My time is all taken up in my business and I don't see any spare time during the week, and Sunday I read what I can of the publications I subscribe for, and they all amount to over thirty dollars a year, and I cannot read more than half of what I want to. I would spend more time to promulgate Freethought if I had it to spare. You know I am an out-and-out Spiritualist, and in all my talks about that I advocate the most liberal Freethought, so that I have earned all kinds of names: Atheist, Deist, Infidel, and every other name that indicates a hate for religious oppression, but I care no more for it than I do for the whistling wind. What I know about spiritualism *I know, I don't believe*; and the vile carping of the whole world would have no effect on me, for I have the full consciousness of right action and living. I send you two dollars for the Magazine, and if every one would do as I do by it, you ought to have ten thousand more subscribers, which I hope you may have during the year. [If all were as independent and brave as friend Lyon, Liberalism would prosper.—EDITOR.]

C. J. Yeary, Knoxville, Tenn.:

Do not infer from my long silence that I am backsliding, falling from grace, or indifferent to the welfare of humanity. I am doing no such things. I am still contending "for the faith once delivered to the saints." I "keep the Sabbath" every day in the week, and observe all the popular religions of the world. On Sunday I keep

the Christian Sabbath ; Monday, the Greek Sabbath ; Tuesday, the Persian ; Wednesday, the Assyrian ; Thursday, the Egyptian ; Friday, the Turkish ; and Saturday, the Jewish Sabbath. I have as many religions as Mary Magdalene possessed devils, and perhaps they trouble me as much. It worries me a good deal to carry so large a stock of religion. I am thinking of discarding some of them. With too many irons in the fire I fear some of them will burn. As this is Saturday—the Jewish Sabbath—I have just called for two she-bears to come from the woods and devour a squad of street urchins who are carrying off my apples. They do not call me baldhead, for I have not a bald hair on my head. If the bears come I will send you a full account of their childish tricks. I would be proud to be one of the One Hundred five-dollar subscribers to the Magazine if I was able. However, I assure you I will do all I can to get up a large club for next year. The FREETHINKERS' MAGAZINE must be sustained by all means. We cannot do without it, and will not.

John R. Kelso, Longmont, Colo. :

Having grown very weary of the cares and the annoyances inseparable from the conducting of a large farm, Etta and I wish to dispose of our entire property here, and, in California, build up a beautiful *little* home in which, in restful quiet, we can spend the ebbing years of our lives ; she with her painting, I with my writing. Can you send us a purchaser ? We know that, if you can, you will do so with pleasure. Inclosed you will find expressed the opinion of our place—"Glen-Etta Home" and the surrounding country—of a disinterested party, a competent judge, the editor of the *Rocky Mountain News*. Our price is \$25,000. Of this, \$10,000 must be cash. On the balance, \$15,000, ample time—five years or more—will be given at our legal rate of robbery (interest) payable annually. Besides the fine fertile farm of 320 acres, this price covers over \$3,000 of ditch stock, \$275 mill stock, \$50 creamery stock ; over 40 head of good cows and heifers, a fine thorough-bred Holstein bull worth over \$100 ; 9 head of horses, a full outfit of farming implements, two wagons, one buggy, large quantities of feed, seed, canned fruits, etc., first-class furniture for 14 rooms, a fine new piano, a large private library, from \$1,000 to \$3,000 of fine paintings, etc., etc. All who know our property, think our terms very reasonable. Our climate is fine and healthful. Colorado is rapidly filling up with enterprising people, and the increase in the value of our farm in five years will almost certainly equal the interest upon the price. It is the most beautiful and desirable country home that can be found in Colorado. [We will give the readers of the Magazine a much fuller description of this beautiful "Country Home" in our next number.—EDITOR.]

J. Burrows, Gibson, Pa. :

Inclosed find five dollars to pay my contribution for the support of the Magazine. On the twenty-sixth day of August, I entered the seventy-third year of my earthly pilgrimage and the fiftieth of what our Christian friends would term progressive Infidelity, although I cannot remember ever believing orthodox theology. The thinning out of our ranks of such stalwart reformers as Bennett, Seaver, Wright, Palmer and Evans, and many others too numerous to mention, who were present at our first Watkins' Convention, most of whom I there met for the first time, impresses me with the necessity of a more earnest effort on the part of us who still live to extend the area of Freethought, not so much by combating the dying gladiator of a decaying and expiring mythological theology, as by elucidating the religion of Nature as it is manifested in the harmonious structure of the stellar universe, and man's relationship

thereto. The eternal progression of mind as well as matter, or, rather, the manner in which mind is evolved from matter and the possibilities which every individualized spirit inherently possesses. When this is done nothing will excite more wonder than the extreme simplicity of the proof as spread out to our observation in the great book of Nature. I will endeavor to illustrate what seems to me the first or foundation principles upon which we may safely rear a superstructure :

First—The absolute infinity or boundlessness of space.

Second—The infinite duration of time, in the past as well as future.

Third—The eternal existence of matter, and the impossibility of its annihilation.

Fourth—All matter is, and eternally has been, under the control of inherent, unchangeable and eternally operative laws, as uncreated and impersonal as mathematical laws, and in the latter respect entirely analogous to them.

Fifth—Every step in the refinement of matter is accompanied by an increase of power which does not cease when that refinement renders it invisible to man's present powers of perception.

Sixth—That what we term death is only a birth into a more exalted and highly progressive state of existence, to be followed by other similar steps of advancement.

Mrs. B. J. Campbell, Spring Bluffs, Wis. :

Inclosed find four dollars to pay the subscriptions to the Magazine by the following-named persons. When I read the letters of those pledging themselves to pay five dollars a year for five years to help the Magazine, I feel almost ashamed to accept my subscription free. We live on a poor, sandy farm, where, by going barefooted in summer and eating buckwheat pancakes in winter, we manage to live and keep out of debt, therefore I cannot pledge myself to pay five dollars a year, but will pledge myself to do all I can to extend the circulation of the FREETHINKERS' MAGAZINE by sending out circulars and lending the Magazine where they will be likely to subscribe for it. [We wish there was one such good lady worker for Freethought in every town in this country.—ED.]

John Huntley, Ellensburg, Oregon :

I shall take the Magazine so long as I can see to read. I am seventy-seven years old. Never went to school twenty days in my life. I will send you several names of new subscribers so soon as they get the money. [And yet our good friend knows more than many college professors, for *he has good common sense*, which they have not.—ED.]

James F. Mallinekrodt, St. Louis, Mo. :

I am glad Freethought has a Magazine printed in the most convincing style of typography, and the only reason I have not yielded to your appeal for help is that I am a Christian since the battle of Armagedden in 1870, and no longer believe in the propriety of being on both sides of the fence at the same time. However, as there has got to be a contrary side till the end of the business, I wish the greatest ability and merit to have the conduct of it. You may renew my subscription. Find two dollars inclosed. [We wish there were more *such* Christians.—ED.]

THE ONE HUNDRED STOCK SUBSCRIBERS.

	Paid.	
1 J. J. McCabe, Albany, N. Y....	\$5.00	46
2 R. H. Bell, Louisville, Ky.....		47
3 Lydia R. Chase, Phila. Pa.....		48
4 F. E. Mende, Philadelphia, Pa.		49
5 A Friend, New York.....		50
6 J. T. Whitmore, Cleveland, O. 5.00		51
7 J. Burrows, Gibson, Pa.....	5.00	52
8 G. E. Swan, M. D., Beaver Dam, Wis.....	10.00	53 54
9 Nathan L. Perkins, Bangor, Me. 5.00		55
10 E. F. Ring, Millston, Wis.....	5.00	56
11 Robert L. Cox, Buffalo, N. Y.. 5.00		57
12 Capt. C. E. Garner, Green Cove Springs, Fla	5.00	58 59
13 Orren H. Warner, Cummington, Mass.....	5.00	60 61
14 Dr. T. B. Englehart, Buffalo, N.Y. 5.00		62
15 W. J. Carpenter, Bridgeport, W. Va.....	5.00	63 64
16 John Wolf, Mt. Morris, Ill....	5.00	65
17 Dr. D. B. Wiggins, Buffalo, N.Y. 5.00		66
18 " <i>Candida et Constantia</i> ," Ind.. 5.00		67
19 R. B. Westbrook, M. D., Phila- delphia, Pa.	5.00	68 69
20 A. B. Bradford, Enon Valley, Pa.....	5.00	70 71
21 A. Schell, Knight's Ferry, Cal. 5.00		72
22 A. Schell, Knight's Ferry, Cal. 5.00		73
23 Almund Owen, Milwaukee, Wis. 5.00		74
24 George Whitcomb, Buffalo, New York.....	5.00	75 76
25 Mrs. Christ Scholfield, San Jose, Cal.....	5.00	77 78
26 Ralph Helm, Syracuse, N. Y. 5.00		79
27 Joseph Sedgebeer, Painesville, O. 5.00		80
28 R. W. Jones, Waukesha, Wis.. 5.00		81
29 Belle Bush, Belvedere, N. J.		82
30 John Riggins, Los Angeles, Cal. 5.00		83
31 D. C. Jenkins, Staples, Minn.. 5.00		84
32 D. Priestly, Milwaukee, Oregon, 5.00		85
33 Mrs. Anna L. Cowan, E. Ran- dolph, N. Y.....		86 87
34 D. Dreamer, Milwaukee, Ore.. 5.00		88
35 Thomas Balkwill, Port Huron, Mich	5.00	89 90
36 A. F. Griswold, Meriden, Conn. 5.00		91
37 A Lady Friend from Maine ... 5.00		92
38 R. Wade, Troy, N. Y.....	5.00	93
39 H. P. Marsh, Palmyra, N. Y.		94
40 Peter Clark, Paoli, Wis.....	5.00	95
41 G. H. Watson, Washington, D.C. 5.00		96
42 W. B. Clark, Worcester, Mass. 5.00		97
43		98
44		99
45		100

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

JOHN E. REMSBURG.

JOHN E. REMSBURG, the subject of this sketch, whose portrait we here present to our readers, is one of the ablest, most popular and best-known lecturers on the Freethought platform. He has, probably, delivered a greater number of public addresses than any other Liberal speaker in this country. He has lectured



since he took the platform in 1880, in some six hundred localities, and to do that has been compelled to travel not less than one hundred and fifty thousand miles. This is a pretty good showing for ten years' labor, and who can estimate the amount of good he has accomplished during that period for this and succeeding generations?

Mr. Remsburg, like every other successful speaker, has a style of his own, dissimilar to that of any other man we ever heard. His manner of public address is more like that of William Lloyd Garrison than

of any other noted lecturer that we remember of listening to. He gesticulates very little when on the platform, either with head or hands, but stands erect, in graceful attitude, by the side of his desk, or in front of it if there be room, and without manuscript or notes of any kind talks directly to his hearers in a plain, earnest, candid, conversational style that at once attracts and rivets the attention of everyone within hearing of his voice. He is a *natural* orator—we mean by this that he is not artificial—when he speaks he is simply John E. Remsburg talking to the people before him. He does not try to imitate Gough, Beecher, Wendell Phillips or Col. Ingersoll, or any other

distinguished orator, as do many foolish public speakers, who for that reason fail. "Be thyself" is the rule Mr. Remsburg strictly observes. He relates few stories or anecdotes and confines himself to a clear presentation and exhaustive elucidation of the subject under discussion. Whatever he attempts to prove he substantiates by unanswerable arguments and the clearest evidence. He would have made a splendid lawyer, for he would have looked up and cited before the court every authority bearing upon the case, and if he had been a physician he would never have prescribed for his patient until he had made a perfect diagnosis of the disease.

To illustrate his thoroughness and, at the same time, "sound orthodoxy" of the old school, we will here relate an amusing circumstance that we well remember: When we resided in Salamanca, N. Y., one of our nearest neighbors was a good old lady of the Hard-shell Baptist persuasion, known as Mother Evans, and, notwithstanding her sound orthodoxy, she was a warm friend of our family, and when Mr. Remsburg delivered his lecture on "Sabbath Breaking" before the Salamanca Freethinkers Convention, the old lady, out of respect to us, attended the lecture. The next morning, at an early hour, she made us a call, and, to our great surprise, commended the lecture very highly. She said, "I liked your preacher first-rate last evening, for he proved everything he said by the Bible. I never heard a preacher quote more scripture in one sermon, and I am sure he quoted it correct, for he gave chapter and verse every time. Most of the ministers," said Mother Evans, "nowadays only take a text from the Bible, then leave the scripture and go off into some new-fangled notions; but your preacher, I noticed, stuck close to the Bible, and, I think, quoted as much Bible as any minister I ever heard."

Notwithstanding Mr. Remsburg is rather a sober, sedate and candid speaker, as above described, he occasionally exhibits a most laughable and interesting vein of sarcastic humor that never fails to "bring down the house." An example of this character occurred at the great Rochester Freethinkers Convention that no one who was present will ever forget. Mr. Remsburg, at that convention, lectured one morning on "Bible Temperance," and as usual was very thorough in its presentation. After quoting a great number of passages from Genesis to Revelation, each without an exception favoring the use of strong drink, he concluded his

argument by declaring, with serious emphasis, that after the most careful research, from the first to the last chapter of the Bible, he could not find but one instance recorded where a person had been known to call for water, and in this instance the applicant for that kind of beverage was in hell.

The space at our command will not allow of our giving a very full biographical sketch of this distinguished Freethinker. We learn that he was born near the Village of Fremont, Ohio, January 7, 1848. His father was of German and his mother of English descent. His father was a nominal Christian, but never a member of any church, and held to broad and liberal views. His mother was a Methodist. When John E. was a young lad his father lost his eyesight, and also met with financial reverses which left him penniless, after which the support of the family devolved most entirely on the mother. Often after midnight the industrious woman might be seen at her work-table plying her needle, and at her side her son John studying his books and receiving instruction from his good mother. This was, verily, an industrial school, and the valuable education there imparted, as might be expected, produced good results. In later years John attended the public district school a number of terms, and one term at a New York State Academy; aside from this he is self-educated.

Young Remsburg entered the Union army as a soldier at a very early age—was said to be the youngest man who carried a musket during the late civil war. He was scarcely sixteen years of age when he enlisted. The surgeon who hastily examined him, and stood him against the wall for measurement, observed that his head just reached the required height, indicated by a mark, but did not notice that his heels were some two inches from the floor. As a private he served at Washington during 1864, participating in the battle of Fort Stevens (where Lincoln was present) and the repulse of Gen. Early's army from Maryland. The following winter, though but seventeen, he did police duty in Nashville, that city being then under military rule. The close of the war found him in the pioneer corps. In addition to an honorable discharge, he received a special certificate of thanks from President Lincoln. After the war he engaged in school teaching. In 1868 he removed to Kansas, and in 1872 was elected Superintendent of Public Instruction for Atchison County. In 1874 the

reform party of Kansas, comprising the Democratic party and the disaffected elements of the Republican party, tendered him the nomination of State Superintendent of Public Instruction. This he declined, preferring a nomination by the Republicans of his county. Among his most zealous supporters were Senator Ingalls, Chief Justice Horton, Gov. Glick (Democrat) and the late Gov. Martin. On the eve of the election Gov. Martin wrote and published the following endorsement of Mr. Remsburg:

J. E. Remsburg, the nominee for Superintendent of Public Instruction, is a teacher of long practical experience, earnestly devoted to the duties of his chosen profession and its interests, and an able and successful educator. He is a young man of fine character and excellent abilities, and will discharge the duties of the place with capacity, faithfulness and earnest devotion. Mr. Remsburg's annual report for 1873 was pronounced by the state superintendent the ablest received from any county in the state, and selections from it have been published in many of the leading educational journals of the country. Mr. Remsburg is a practical reformer, and in the discharge of his official duties has done much to reform abuses that existed in the office. We want the voters of Atchison county to consider these claims without prejudice, and we are sure that their verdict will be in favor of J. E. Remsburg, the practical reformer."

On the day after the election the *Atchison Champion* contained the following:

J. E. Remsburg, the Republican candidate for Superintendent of Public Instruction, has five hundred and fifty-nine majority, the largest given for any candidate. The "Reform" ticket, with the exception of superintendent, was carried at Oak Mills by a vote of five to one. At Oak Mills Remsburg overcame a "Reform" majority of eighty-two and carried the precinct by thirty votes. Mr. Remsburg is the only Republican who ever carried this precinct at state election. He carried his home precinct, Sumner, by a vote of four to one.

This shows the esteem in which Mr. Remsburg is held by his neighbors. His township, comprising the precincts of Sumner and Oak Mills, was the banner Democratic township of the state. It was also one of the most orthodox religiously, nine-tenths of the voters being Roman Catholics, Southern Methodists, Campbellites or Baptists. Yet in spite of his politics and his Infidelity they gave him an almost unanimous vote. And this notwithstanding he did not solicit their support or even go to the polls.

While nominally a believer in his youth, he was never a member of any church. When about twenty-one the subject of theology was presented to his mind. At that time Freethought literature was unknown to him, but his reason rejected orthodoxy and his progress toward Freethought was steady and rapid and he soon became a radical Freethinker. He soon decided to enter the lecture field and proclaim the Gospel of Liberalism to a

bigoted world, and he has, surely, proved himself to be admirably adapted to the work he undertook.

Mr. Remsburg has, during the last ten years, in connection with his duties as lecturer, written and published many valuable works. Among these are the following: "Life of Thomas Paine," "The Image Breaker," "False Claims," "The Apostle of Liberty," "Bible Morals," "Sabbath Breaking,"* "The Fathers of Our Republic," and the *Truth Seeker* is now publishing a very valuable and interesting series of articles by him which we learn will soon be put into book form, entitled, "Was Lincoln a Christian?"

His lectures have been translated into German, Swedish, Norwegian and some of the Asiatic languages, and have as large a circulation in Europe, India and Australia as in this country. Including newspaper editions, fully three hundred thousand copies of his lectures have been circulated.

In 1870 he married Nora M. Eiler, a daughter of one of the old Free State pioneers of Kansas, a worthy and admirable woman, who, with the aid of their son George J., takes good care of his splendid farm and beautiful home in his nearly constant absence on his lecturing tours. This son is a "chip of the old block," and is already doing good work in the Liberal cause. Mr. R. resides near the town of Atchison and is the owner and possessor of the most beautiful country seat in the State of Kansas. We are glad to know that there is now and then a heretic who has no title to a "mansion in the skies" well provided with one here on this solid earth.

THE FREETHINKERS' MAGAZINE, VOL. VIII., 290.

ONE number more and the present volume of this Magazine is a thing of the past. We would like here to speak at considerable length of the next volume, but our space will not permit. And this suggests the question: Shall we have *more space* next year? That question we now submit to the friends of the Magazine. On page 515 you can see how many more names it requires to make up the One Hundred proposed Safety Committee. If that list is fully completed and the first payments of \$5.00 made

* These books are for sale at this office. Price 25 cents each.

by November 25th, we will add sixteen pages to each number of the next volume. We really need more than that number of additional pages to accommodate our contributors and correspondents. The addition would most certainly greatly augment the value of the Magazine. Friends, what do you say? We know of more than one hundred of our readers who have not, as yet, responded to our recent "stock" appeal who are perfectly able to do so. Will you come forward *at once* and put the Magazine on a firm basis and enable us to add the proposed number of pages?

If the addition of sixteen pages be made we shall not increase the regular subscription price. Whether the Magazine be enlarged or not, our club rates, for next year, will be as follows: For a club of five or more, up to ten, \$1.50 each; for a club of ten or more, \$1.25 each. That is as cheap as the Magazine can be afforded.

There will be a number of improvements in the next volume. We have contracted for the latest and best style of illustrations. We have permanently engaged a number of new and able contributors. One of these is the world-renowned Philanthropist, Philosopher and Reformer, George Jacob Holyoake of England. Something from Col. Ingersoll may be expected nearly every month, Prof. Thomas Davidson will write often, T. B. Wakeman will be a regular contributor. Hon. A. B. Bradford will furnish a very able article for the first three numbers of Vol. VIII, and all the old contributors, whom space will not allow us here to mention, will be retained. And last, but not least, we shall have four or five of the ablest female writers in this country as regular contributors.

And now to business: Every subscriber who we have generously allowed, against our standing rule, to become indebted to us on subscription, we ask to *pay up* immediately. Those whose subscriptions expire with the next number, will confer a great favor by immediately renewing their subscription for another year, and those who propose to procure clubs for Vol. VIII should commence their work in earnest. Procure the names, and if any are not prepared to pay now, get their promise to pay before the names are sent in.

Friends, money enough should be raised during the next thirty or sixty days to defray the running expenses of the Magazine for the next six months. Shall we have a generous response to this appeal from all sections of the country?

ALL SORTS.

READER, have you renewed your subscription for this Magazine for next year?

OUR artist is preparing a new and greatly improved illustration of the Bruno monument that will appear in the December Magazine.

L. K. WASHBURN has been appointed editor of the *Boston Investigator*. No better selection could have been made. In the December Magazine we expect to publish his likeness and a sketch of his life.

OUR readers will remember a communication published in the January Magazine by Carolyn Faville Ober. She is one of the ablest female writers in this country. She has promised to be a contributor to the next volume of this Magazine. Friends, fill up the "One Hundred" list and we will give you a grand Magazine next year.

SAMOS PARSONS, our eighty-six-year-old friend of San Jose, Cal., has again been showering blessings upon his Liberal friends all over the country in the shape of \$10 and \$5 bank-bills to the amount of \$95. We most gratefully received our portion of the "filthy lucre." According to his means Brother Parsons is the most liberal Liberal in America.

SINCE the issue of the last number of this Magazine we learn of the death of our most worthy friend, Erastus Daley, of Yorkshire, N. Y. Mr. Daley has been for many years one of the most active and earnest workers in the Liberal ranks in Western New York. We hope to be able to give a more extended notice, and possibly his likeness in some future number.

RECENTLY the great Liberal Hall in Waco, Texas, the only one of the kind in the South, was destroyed by fire. About the same time Talmage's "Tabernacle" was "providentially" burned down. Tal-

mage calls on all church people and "*those who are not church people*" to contribute for a new tabernacle. Mr. Shaw, the proprietor of the Liberal Hall, should do likewise, only changing the call so as to read "all those who are not church people and also those who are church people." Liberals throughout the whole country ought to help Mr. Shaw erect a new and better Hall in place of the old one.

THE *Boston Investigator*, in a very good notice of the "Bruno Pamphlet," among other things, says:

"Mr. Holyoake's paper is written in the closest sympathy with his subject, and his noble appreciation of Bruno's lofty principles and sublime courage came from a kindred heart. Mr. Wakeman's essay is exceedingly suggestive and interesting. It deals with the subject in a way that brings Bruno nearer to our times and makes him a part of the living thoughts upon which the age rests. The possible influence of Bruno upon Shakespeare and Goethe is finely drawn, and the whole essay is a valuable contribution to the library of Freethought literature. Every line of the pamphlet is alive with thought and feeling, and the work ought to be read by thousands."

OUR readers will remember that in the September number of the Magazine, on page 420, we published a "New Church Creed," by Joseph F. Pond of Cleveland, Ohio. The following letter informs us that the author of that very good creed has passed away:

"CLEVELAND, O., Oct. 2, 289.

H. L. GREEN, ESQ.:

Dear Sir—I think it my duty to inform you of the death of Mr. Joseph F. Pond of this city. He had been ill for some time, but was much pleased with his "New Church Creed," which was published in the September number of the FREETHINKERS' MAGAZINE. He was a good man, very kind and liberal in thought. We buried him this forenoon and the world lost a good man.

Very truly yours,
FRANK JOHN."

WE clip the following item from the *New York World*:

The departure of Frederick Douglass, United States Minister to Hayti, for his post next Saturday on a government man-of-war will strike the thoughtful man as a most suggestive event. Here is a man who was born a slave, whose masters were protected by law, a man who has been chased by bloodhounds and who was obliged to flee from the land of his birth, a man who at one time seemed to have no career save that of a fugitive or a salable piece of flesh, who is honored to-day by the government and is considered a fit person to represent the United States in a foreign land. The wildest flights of the most imaginative novelist never begot a more wonderful romance than the story of this man's life.

And some thirty-five years ago we heard Fred. Douglass say, in a speech at the "Waterloo Meeting," that the most dangerous thing that a slave could encounter when fleeing for his liberty was an orthodox prayer-meeting. And now a prayer-meeting administration confers these honors upon him. What a change!

DR. MCGLYNN, the Priest who stands, as it were, with one foot on the land of Science and the other on the sea of Theology, has this to say of Bruno:

"I am not here to advocate the philosophical vagaries or the theological heresies of the man who was burned alive in Rome in the year 1600. I do not agree with his philosophy, still less do I agree with his theology; but it seems to me that he must have been an honest man. He suffered seven years' incarceration, and at the end was led out to be burned at the stake. During any moment of those seven years by a recantation, by retracting his errors, he could have saved himself from burning and could have obtained his liberty. The fact that he did not recant makes me feel that he was an honest man. It matters not so much to me whether what he thought was true or not, I do love to believe that as that man walked to the stake to be burned alive he went a martyr to that truth of truths, that a man must obey the dictates of his conscience, which is to him the voice of God. I would take my place rather with the man then and there at the stake than with the man who was applying the torch

to the fagots; although, I make haste to explain, I would have agreed almost entirely with the theology of the man who was setting fire to the fagots, and not very much with the theology of Giordano Bruno."

IN this number of the Magazine we publish, from the *Twentieth Century*, a lecture by its editor, Hugh O. Pentecost, that we are sure will interest our readers; also on the second page of the cover we give place to an advertisement of the *Twentieth Century*. As we have said before, we are not in accord with the leading idea of Mr. P., the one on the land-tax question (possibly because we do not fully understand it), but we are in love with his downright honesty of expression, and it would seem from the following that we clip from a late issue of that paper, that Col. Ingersoll, at least, likes Mr. Pentecost's sermons, notwithstanding Mr. Pentecost *claims* to be a true follower of Jesus. Mr. Pentecost says editorially:

"We get very pleasant letters from time to time from ministers appreciative of our work through this paper; and now, as if to show how nearly men upon a high plane think alike, here comes one from Colonel Robert G. Ingersoll, a very practical one too. He says:

"Enclosed find my check for ten dollars—part payment for the pleasure your sermons have given me."

I have never met nor heard Colonel Ingersoll, but I am glad to hear from him—glad to know that he, like so many Christians, is willing to help a paper whose motto is: "Hear the other side."

"BILL NYE" thus relates in the *World* a ludicrous circumstance connected with Horace Seaver's funeral:

When Horace Seaver of Boston, was buried, Mr. Stuart Robson, among others, was asked to act as pall bearer. He wrote in reply to the invitation that he would feel honored to accept, and at the time set he rode over from Cohasset by a fast train. That is where he made a mistake. If he had read the wisdom of the great scholar and railway savant, Robert J. Burdette, he would have known that the man who is in a hurry should take the slow train. The Cannon Ball train is generally three hours late and the

Flying Dutchman is frequently abandoned, but the Jerk-Water-Mixed train is reported on time.

So Mr. Robson was a little late and the enormous audience thronged the aisles and extended even outside of Paine Hall, so that he could not get in at all. Col. Ingersoll was delivering his tribute to the dead. He spoke of Mr. Seaver's great kindness of heart and said that: "He did not ask God to forgive his enemies. He forgave them himself. His sympathy was wide as want and like the sky, bent above a suffering world. He knew that antiquity added nothing to probability—that lapse of time can never take the place of cause—and that the dust can never gather thick enough upon mistakes to make them equal with the truth."

But Mr. Robson could not get in. He stated to those on the outskirts of the crowd, that he was "one of the pall bearers and must get in."

"Oh, look at the pall bearer," remarked the crowd. "Isn't he a pretty pall bearer?" queried those who could not get

in themselves, as they bored holes in Mr. Robson with their keen elbows. He tried once more to make it understood that he was one of the pall bearers, but his voice split up the back and a loud round of mirth was the immediate reply.

"Afterward," said Mr. Robson, "I learned that several others had tried to get in before I arrived, on the ground that they were pall bearers, and so the crowd was ready for me. By that time, if I had known that by giving my name I would have been carried in on a bed of roses, I could not have done it. I went away, and as I did so I heard a man say: "He is indeed a healthy-looking pall bearer, is he not? He is probably someone who lives here in Boston and has made a bet that he would get in and hear the address. Or perhaps he is a man who furnishes gloom for funerals. He looks like it. Did you notice his sad face?"

Mr. Robson then came away, and taking a slow train for Cohasset, was very soon home.

BOOK REVIEW.

"SECULARISM AND THEOSOPHY," by G. W. Foote, and published by the "Progressive Publishing Company" of London, is, like everything else that Mr. Foote writes, full of food for thought. It is a rejoinder to Mrs. Besant's pamphlet recently published. It contains sixteen pages, and the price is twopence.

THE CANDLE FROM UNDER THE BUSHEL; OR, THIRTEEN HUNDRED AND SIX QUESTIONS TO THE CLERGY. By William Hart. Truth Seeker Company, New York. Pages 205. Price 50 cts. For sale at this office.

One hundred thousand copies of this book ought to be circulated among the people. It is an orthodox eye-opener. Nothing like it has appeared for a long time. Here is Mr. Hart's "Preface" in full:

"Search the Scriptures" was a command of Christ. The writer, while a sincere church-member, obeyed the com-

mand by making the "search," which "search" led to the propounding of these questions. The God herein alluded to, under his various appellations, is none other than the Jewish, or Christian's, triune God, Father, Son and Ghost."

We shall have more to say of this most valuable work in the December Magazine. In the meantime we ask each of our readers to send to this office for a copy.

"FREE RUM," by Ezra H. Heywood, is a pamphlet of twenty-three pages, and the price is 15 cents. This is published as a "Temperance" tract, and is written in Mr. Heywood's clear, argumentative style and cannot but interest the reader whatever may be his opinions on the "Liquor Question." I think Mr. Heywood never has an opinion but what he qualifies it by the adjective or adverb "Free." Those of our readers who may desire this pamphlet will order it of Mr. Heywood, at Princeton, Mass. It is not "dry" reading. N.E.F.

CHURCH AND STATE.

WHAT SOME OF THE LEADING FREETHINKERS SAY OF THE NEW
PAMPHLET—EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS RECEIVED.

LUCY N. COLMAN, Syracuse, N. Y.:

It is very timely, and should have a very extensive circulation. Whoever the author (Jefferson) is, the "criticism" proves him to be a polished writer,—a scholar of more than ordinary ability and experience. His arguments, which are unanswerable, make the pamphlet of great value. I wish our people would awake to the dangers that threaten Liberty, and circulate such works as this criticism extensively.

J. J. McCABE, Albany, N. Y.:

Every member of the New York State Legislature, the officers of both houses, and the Governor, have been furnished with a copy of "Church and State." At this particular time it is, in my estimation, an excellent document to put into the hands of the men who are intrusted with the making of our laws. The questions so ably considered by the writer should not be allowed to be sent to the rear in the struggle which is going on at present in the political arena. In the conflict which is now waxing hot between organized capital and labor, some of the representatives of the great commercial corporations are making overtures to secure an alliance with those who are never idle in the matter of proposing legislation in the interest of the Church. This pamphlet will call attention to the fact that there are other questions than those, which some people are interested in.

PARKER PILLSBURY, Concord, N. H.:

It surely should go out to the world in great numbers. Seldom is so much important Church history placed before the people in so compact and well-compiled form. And you, Mr. Editor, have done the world a just service in reproducing it from the pages of the Magazine. And all who can should not only read, but assist in its circulation to the widest possible extent.

T. B. WAKEMAN, New York:

This little work, "Church and State," by "Jefferson," is an invaluable *multum in parvo*. It shows the Bible is the *nest-egg of superstition*. The bigots want it kept in the public schools as a fetch for that reason. For that very reason it should not be there at all. Its historical or other value is simply as a record of barbarisms never to be read but as an exhibition of the evolved past, which the present is to avoid, if it can. How did this barbarous old book happen to get fastened on to young America, like the "Old Man of the Sea" on poor Sinbad? That is a question all-important, and yet not one man in ten thousand can answer it until he has read this little book. I was surprised at the valuable information it contained. By all means, read it, and see that your neighbor does the same.

ALLEN PRINGLE, Selby, Canada:

I have read "Church and State" with great interest, as well as pleasure. Its arguments for the separation of Church and State, and the complete secularization of the public schools are as timely as they are conclusive, at this juncture, when the Jesuits in this country and the Church (including the Jesuits) in that are making such encroachments upon Liberty and menacing the educational interests of both countries. "Church and State" ought to be widely circulated and read, both in Canada and the United States.

SUSAN H. WIXON, Fall River:

I have read this excellent pamphlet of twenty-eight pages with great interest. The author deals with the popular errors engrafted upon our institutions with a vigorous pen, and pointedly shows the remedy for existing evils. The arguments are clear, logical, comprehensive and conclusive. At the very low price the pamphlet is offered for sale it ought to have an immense circulation.

CARRIE L. JOHNSON, South Bend, Ind.:

"Church and State" is interesting, instructive, to the point, and timely. Timely, because the "Blair Bill" is before us, and Catholics and Protestants show a disposition to quarrel over the public schools and destroy their usefulness. Every one should read "Church and State," and I hope it will have a circulation equal to its merits.

F. M. HOLLAND, Concord, Mass.:

The pamphlet is just what we need at present, and I hope it will be widely circulated. It is bright and interesting throughout, and very well written. The arguments against using the Bible as a text-book are very strong; and these, based on its discountenancing cremation, as well as its giving false ideas of the causes of disease, have the additional advantage of novelty. This part of the pamphlet alone recommends it to patronage.

L. K. WASHBURN, Revere, Mass.:

I have only words of commendation for that masterly pamphlet, entitled "Church and State," by "Jefferson." It is the work of a mind that loves Liberty, and knows the worth of it to the human race. The author discusses the question of "The Bible in the Public Schools" with vigor and clearness. His words are full of destiny, and should be read from Maine to California. Your labor in connection with it should be recognized and rewarded.

Price—Single number, 10 cents; five numbers, 30 cents; ten numbers, 50 cents; twenty-five numbers and over, 4 cents each.

Address
FREETHINKERS' MAGAZINE, Buffalo, N. Y.

ROBERT G. INGERSOLL'S WRITINGS.

ONLY AUTHORIZED EDITIONS.

- Vol. I.—THE GODS AND OTHER LECTURES.** Contents: "The Gods," "Humboldt," "Thomas Paine," "Individuality," "Heretics and Heresies." 12mo. 253 pages, cloth, \$1.25; paper, 50 cents.
- Vol. II.—THE GHOSTS, AND OTHER LECTURES.** Contents: "The Ghosts," "The Liberty of Man, Woman and Child," "The Declaration of Independence," "About Farming in Illinois," "Tribute to Rev. Alexander Clark." 12mo. Cloth, \$1.25; paper, 50 cents.
- Vol. III.—SOME MISTAKES OF MOSES.** 12mo. 278 pages; cloth, \$1.25; paper, 50 cents.
- Vol. IV.—INGERSOLL ON TALMAGIAN THEOLOGY.** (New.) 443 pages; cloth, gilt top, \$2.00; plain cloth, \$1.25; paper, 50 cents.
- WHAT MUST WE DO TO BE SAVED?** 89 pages, 12mo. Paper, 25 cents.
- INGERSOLL'S LECTURES COMPLETE.** In one superb volume. 1,300 pages; octavo, half calf, gilt, mottled edges. Price, post-paid, \$5.00.
- THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.** A series of articles on the Christian Religion by COL. ROBERT G. INGERSOLL, JUDGE JEREMIAH S. BLACK and PROF. GEO. P. FISHER. The only complete and authorized edition; one volume, 8vo., 43 pages; cloth, \$1.00; paper, 50 cents.
- VINDICATION OF THOMAS PAINE** from the attacks of the New York Observer, by ROBERT G. INGERSOLL. Paper, 25 cents.
- THE INGERSOLL-FIELD DISCUSSION.** Just out. A large octavo of 96 pages. Price: cloth, \$1.00; paper, 50 cents.
- BLASPHEMY.** COL. INGERSOLL'S argument on the trial of C. B. Reynolds, at Morristown, N. J. Handsome 8vo., 86 pages, beautiful type, fine paper. Price: cloth, 50 cents; paper cover, 25 cents.

PHOTOGRAPHS OF COL. INGERSOLL.

Superb Photo, 22 x 28,	- - - -	\$5.00	} A Beautiful Crayon Portrait, life size (head and bust), of Mr. Ingersoll will be sent by express on receipt of \$50.00.
Panel " 10 1/2 x 17,	- - - -	3.00	
Boudoir " "	- - - -	1.00	
Cabinet " "	- - - -	.40	
Card " "	- - - -	.20	

COL. INGERSOLL'S NOTE TO THE PUBLIC.

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 10th, 1880.

I wish to notify the public that all books and pamphlets purporting to contain my lectures, and not containing the imprint of Mr. C. P. Farrell as publisher, are spurious, grossly inaccurate, filled with mistakes, horribly printed, and outrageously unjust to me. The publishers of all such are simply literary thieves and pirates, and are obtaining money from the public under false pretenses. These wretches have published one lecture under four titles, and several others under two or three.

I take this course to warn the public that these publications are fraudulent; the only correct editions being those published by Mr. C. P. Farrell.

ROBERT G. INGERSOLL.

AN ELEGANT PUBLICATION,

PROSE-POEMS,

BY ROBERT G. INGERSOLL.

This is a book of selections, from the published and unpublished writings and sayings of the author. It contains several of the brief orations, tributes and toasts which have become classic, besides choice extracts from the speeches, lectures, arguments interviews and letters of the author. It is needless to say, that thus brought together, they form a cluster of lustrous gems. An elegantly engraved steel portrait of Mr. Ingersoll with fac-simile of autograph, forms the frontispiece.

In workmanship, the volume is the finest that printer and binder can produce. It is printed on heavy, tinted paper, in large, beautiful type, with beveled edges and faultless presswork.

Quarto size, large margins, about 250 pages. Prices, cloth, \$2.50; half-calf, \$4.50; full Turkey morocco, \$7.50; tree-calf, \$9.00.

Orders from the trade and the liberal public are solicited. Sent by mail or express, prepaid, on receipt of price.

All the above works for sale by H. L. GREEN, Buffalo, N. Y.